

HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY:

INCLUDING THAT OF  
THE POPES TO THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

BY HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,  
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN NINE VOLUMES.—Vol. V.

NEW IMPRESSION. OF THE  
FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.  
1883.

**PRINTED BY  
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,  
LONDON AND BECCLES.**

## CONTENTS

OR

## THE FIFTH VOLUME.

## BOOK VIII.—*continued.*

## CHAPTER VIII.

ALEXANDER III.—VICTOR IV.—THOMAS-A-BECKET.

A.D.		PAGE
	Henry's ambassadors at Sens .. .. .. ..	69
	Becket at Sens .. .. .. ..	70
	Becket at Pontigny .. .. .. ..	73
1165	Negotiations with the Emperor—Diet at Wurtzburg .. .. .. ..	74
	Becket at Vezelay .. .. .. ..	79
1166	John of Oxford at Rome .. .. .. ..	85
1167	William of Pavia—Cardinal Otho—Legates ..	88
	Flight of Frederick from Italy .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
1168	Meeting at Gisors .. .. .. ..	90
1169	Meeting at Montmirail .. .. .. ..	94
	War of France and England .. .. .. ..	97
	Excommunication of the Bishops by Becket ..	98
	Gratian and Vivian Legates .. .. .. ..	99
	Meeting at Montmartre .. .. .. ..	105
	King's proclamation .. .. .. ..	107
	Commission to Archbishop of Rouen and Bishop of Nevers .. .. .. ..	108
	Bishops absolved .. .. .. ..	109
	Coronation of Prince of Wales .. .. .. ..	110
1170	Treaty of Fretteville .. .. .. ..	112
	Return of Becket to England .. .. .. ..	118
	Assassination .. .. .. ..	125
	Reconciliation of the King at Avranches .. .. .. ..	128
	Penance at Canterbury .. .. .. ..	129
	Becket a saint .. .. .. ..	131

## CHAPTER IX.

## ALEXANDER III.—POPES TO CLOSE OF TWELFTH CENTURY.

1165	Alexander embarks for Italy .. .. .. ..	135
1167	Pestilence in Frederick's army .. .. .. ..	139
1176	Truce of Venice .. .. .. ..	142
1179	Death of Alexander III. .. .. .. ..	147
1181	Pope Lucius III. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
1185	Pope Urban III. .. .. .. ..	149
1187	Pope Gregory VIII. .. .. .. ..	153
	Pope Clement III. .. .. .. ..	154
1189	Barbarossa's crusade and death .. .. .. ..	155
	Pope Cœlestin III. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>

## CONTENTS OF VOL. V

v

A.D.		PAGE
	Coronation of the Emperor Henry .. .. ..	156
	Demolition of Tusculum .. .. ..	158
	Imprisonment of Richard I. of England .. ..	159
1194	The Emperor Henry in Italy .. .. ..	162
1195	Cruelties in Sicily .. .. ..	164
1196	Frederick elected King of the Romans .. ..	165
	Queen Constance .. .. ..	166
1197	Death of the Emperor Henry .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
1198	Death of Pope Cœlestine III. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>

---

## BOOK IX.

## INNOCENT III.

## CHAPTER I.

## ROME AND ITALY.

	The Papal autocracy .. .. .. .. ..	168
	Its growth .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
	Effect of Crusades .. .. .. .. ..	172
	Innocent III. .. .. .. .. ..	175
1160 or 1161	Birth of Innocent .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
	Education and connexions .. .. .. .. ..	176
1190	Cardinalate .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
1198	Election to Papacy .. .. .. .. ..	178
	State of Christendom .. .. .. .. ..	179
1198-1202	I. The City of Rome .. .. .. .. ..	180
	Hatred of Rome and Viterbo .. .. .. .. ..	183
	Orsini and Scotti .. .. .. .. ..	184
	II. Italy .. .. .. .. ..	186
	Markwald .. .. .. .. ..	188
	Conrad of Lutzenberg .. .. .. .. ..	189
1198	Queen Constantia .. .. .. .. ..	190
	Markwald before Monte Casino .. .. .. .. ..	193
1199	Markwald excommunicated .. .. .. .. ..	195
1201	Walter of Brienne .. .. .. .. ..	198
1202	Death of Markwald .. .. .. .. ..	200
	Frederick II.—his youth .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>

## CHAPTER II.

## INNOCENT AND THE EMPIRE.

A.D.		AGE
1198	Philip the Swabian, King of the Romans .. ..	203
Ibid.	Otho of Brunswick .. .. .. .. .. ..	204
Ibid.	Conduct of Innocent .. .. .. .. .. ..	207
	Coronation of Philip .. .. .. .. .. ..	209
	Civil war .. .. .. .. .. ..	210
	Innocent's declaration .. .. .. .. .. ..	211
1199	Envos to Rome .. .. .. .. .. ..	214
	War renewed .. .. .. .. .. ..	215
1200	Pope Innocent's Deliberation .. .. .. .. .. ..	217
	Activity of Innocent .. .. .. .. .. ..	221
1201	Coronation of Otho .. .. .. .. .. ..	222
	Addresses of the German Princes .. .. .. .. .. ..	223
1198-1208	Ten years' war .. .. .. .. .. ..	228
1207	Absolution of Philip .. .. .. .. .. ..	229
1208	Murder of Philip .. .. .. .. .. ..	230

## CHAPTER III.

## INNOCENT AND THE EMPEROR OTHO IV.

1209	Otho Emperor—Crowned in Rome .. .. ..	233
	Enmity between Innocent and Otho .. .. ..	234
1211	Otho excommunicated .. .. .. .. ..	236
Ibid.	Movements in Germany .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
	Overtures to Frederick .. .. .. .. ..	238
1212	Otho in Germany .. .. .. .. ..	239
	Frederick King of the Romans .. .. .. .. ..	241
1214	Battle of Bouvines .. .. .. .. ..	242

## CHAPTER IV.

## INNOCENT AND PHILIP AUGUSTUS OF FRANCE.

	Monarchy of France .. .. .. .. .. ..	243
1196	Marriage of Philip with Ingeburga of Denmark .. .. .. .. .. ..	245
	Agnes of Meran .. .. .. .. .. ..	246

A.D.		PAGE
1198	Innocent's letter on the marriage of Philip Augustus .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	247
1199	Interdict .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	249
	Wrath of Philip Augustus .. .. .. .. .. ..	252
1200	Innocent inflexible .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	254
	Council of Soissons .. .. .. .. .. ..	257
	Death of Agnes of Meran .. .. .. .. .. ..	258

## CHAPTER V.

## INNOCENT AND ENGLAND.

	Richard I. .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	260
1199	John's accession, divorce, and marriage .. .. ..	262
1200	Contest with Philip Augustus .. .. .. .. .. ..	263
	Death of Arthur .. .. .. .. .. ..	264
1206	Loss of Norman dominions .. .. .. .. .. ..	266
1205	Quarrel with the Pope about Archbishop of Canterbury .. .. .. .. .. ..	267
1206	Election—Appeal .. .. .. .. .. ..	269
	Stephen Langton .. .. .. .. .. ..	270
	Fury of John .. .. .. .. .. ..	271
	He persecutes the Clergy .. .. .. .. .. ..	272
	Excommunication of John .. .. .. .. .. ..	276
1211	Subjects released from allegiance .. .. .. .. ..	277
1213	His throne offered by the Pope to any conqueror Offer accepted by Philip Augustus .. .. .. .. ..	279
	ib.	
	John's desperation .. .. .. .. .. ..	281
	Pandulph Legate .. .. .. .. .. ..	ib.
1213	Treaty with the Pope .. .. .. .. .. ..	282
	Surrender of the kingdom to the Pope .. .. .. .. ..	283
	Wrath of Philip Augustus .. .. .. .. .. ..	287
	John embarks for Poitou .. .. .. .. .. ..	289
	Nobles refuse to accompany him .. .. .. .. .. ..	ib.
	Second surrender of St. Paul's, London .. .. .. .. ..	291
1214	Meeting at St. Edmousbury .. .. .. .. .. ..	293
1215	Magna Charta .. .. .. .. .. ..	295
	Pope Innocent's letter .. .. .. .. .. ..	297
	Langton in Rome .. .. .. .. .. ..	300

## CHAPTER VI.

## INNOCENT AND SPAIN.

A.D.		PAGE
1212	Battle of Naves de Tolosa .. .. .. .. ..	306
	King of Portugal .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
	King of Leon .. .. .. .. ..	307
	King of Navarre .. .. .. .. ..	310
1204	King of Arragon in Rome .. .. .. .. ..	311
	Lesser kingdoms of Europe .. .. .. .. ..	314
	Andrew of Hungary .. .. .. .. ..	315

## CHAPTER VII.

## INNOCENT AND THE EAST.

1199	Innocent urges the Crusade .. .. .. .. ..	320
	Fulk of Neuilly .. .. .. .. ..	326
	Venice .. .. .. .. ..	331
1201	Villehardouin's Treaty .. .. .. .. ..	334
1202	Crusaders at Venice .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
	Proposal to attack Zara .. .. .. .. ..	335
	Alexius Comnenus .. .. .. .. ..	337
	Crusade sets sail .. .. .. .. ..	340
	Taking of Zara .. .. .. .. ..	341
	Treaty with Alexius .. .. .. .. ..	343
	Innocent condemns the treaty .. .. .. .. ..	345
1203	Taking of Constantinople .. .. .. .. ..	347
	Partition .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
	Establishment of Latin Christianity .. .. .. .. ..	349
	Plunder—Reliques .. .. .. .. ..	352
	Election of Emperor .. .. .. .. ..	353
	Latin Patriarch .. .. .. .. ..	354
1206	Constitution of Clergy .. .. .. .. ..	364
	Captivity of Emperor Baldwin .. .. .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
	Innocent's letters to King of Bulgaria .. .. .. .. ..	367
	Effects of conquest of Constantinople .. .. .. .. ..	369

## CHAPTER VIII.

## INNOCENT AND THE ANTI-SACERDOTALISTS.

A.D.		PAGE
	Crusade against heretics .. .. .. .. ..	374
	Apparent quiet under Innocent III. .. .. .. ..	376
	The Sectaries .. .. .. .. ..	377
	Three classes .. .. .. .. ..	383
	I. Simple Anti-Sacerdotalists .. .. .. ..	384
	Peter de Brueys—the Petrobussians .. ..	<i>i.b.</i>
	Henry the Deacon .. .. .. ..	386
	Tanchelin .. .. .. ..	389
	Eudo de Stella—Heretics in Vezelay ..	390
	II. Biblical Anti-Sacerdotalists .. .. ..	391
	Peter Waldo .. .. .. ..	392
	The Noble Lesson .. .. .. ..	397
	III. Manichean heretics .. .. .. ..	398
	The Paulicians .. .. .. ..	400
	Western Manichæism .. .. .. ..	401
	Languedoc .. .. .. ..	403
1198	Innocent's letter to Archbishop of Auch .. ..	408
1200	Cistercian Legates .. .. .. ..	409
	Fulk Bishop of Toulouse .. .. .. ..	412
	Count Raymond of Toulouse .. .. .. ..	413
	Peter de Castelnau Legate .. .. .. ..	415
1208	Murder of Peter de Castelnau .. .. .. ..	418
	Crusade against Count Raymond .. .. .. ..	420
1209	Penance of Count Raymond .. .. .. ..	424
	Raymond joins the Crusade .. .. .. ..	425
	Three armies .. .. .. ..	427
	Peter de Vaux Cernay .. .. .. ..	<i>b.</i>
	Siege of Beziers .. .. .. ..	428
	of Carcassonne .. .. .. ..	429
	Simon de Montfort .. .. .. ..	432
	Continued persecution of Raymond .. .. .. ..	433
	Raymond in Rome .. .. .. ..	434
1210	Progress of Crusade—Siege of Minerve .. ..	435
	New demands on Count Raymond .. .. .. ..	438
1212	Raymond takes up arms .. .. .. ..	441
	Siege of Lavaur .. .. .. ..	443
	De Montford Sovereign Prince .. .. .. ..	445

## CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

A.D.		PAGE
<b>1212</b>	King of Arragon .. .. .. .. .. .. ..	<b>447</b>
<b>1213</b>	Battle of Muret .. .. .. .. .. ..	<b>449</b>
<b>1214</b>	Simon de Montfort Master of Languedoc .. ..	<b>450</b>
<b>1215</b>	Fourth Lateran Council .. .. .. .. ..	<b>452</b>
<b>1216, 1217</b>	War renewed in Languedoc .. .. .. ..	<b>458</b>
	Count Raymond in Toulouse .. .. .. ..	<b>461</b>
	Death of Simon de Montfort .. .. .. ..	<b>462</b>
<b>1222</b>	Crusade of Louis VIII. of France .. .. ..	<i>ib.</i>
<b>1228</b>	Treaty of Paris .. .. .. .. ..	<b>463</b>
<b>1229</b>	Council of Toulouse .. .. .. .. ..	<b>465</b>

HISTORY  
OF  
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

---

---

BOOK VIII.—*continued.*

---

CHAPTER VIII.

Alexander III.—Victor IV.—Thomas à Becket.

THE whole conclave must have had the determined courage of Hadrian to concur in the election of a Pope. A schism was inevitable; a schism now the natural defence of the Empire against the Papacy, as a rebellion in Germany or Italy was that of the Papacy against the Empire. On one side were the zealous churchmen, who would hazard all for the supremacy of the spiritual power, those who thought the Sicilian alliance the safer and more legitimate policy of the See of Rome: and in Rome itself a faction of nobles, headed by the Frangipani, who maintained the papal authority in the city. On the other side were those who were attached to, or who dreaded the power of Barbarossa; the republican, or Arnoldino party in Rome; a few perhaps who loved peace, and thought it the best wisdom of the church to conciliate the Emperor. The conflicting accounts of the proceedings in the conclave were made public, on one side by the Pope, on the other by the Cardinals of the opposite faction,\* and

---

\* Both of these documents are in Radovicus.

compel the inevitable conclusion that the passions of each party had effaced either all perception of, or all respect for truth. Alexander III. is more minute and particular in his appeal to universal Christendom on the justice of his election. On the third day of debate fourteen of the Cardinals agreed in the choice of himself, Roland, the Cardinal of St. Mark, the chancellor of the Apostolic See, one of those legates who had shown so much audacity, and confronted so much peril at the Diet at Besançon. The cope was brought forth in which he was to be invested. Conscious of his insufficiency for this great post, he struggled against it with the usual modest reluctance.<sup>b</sup> Three only of the Cardinals, Octavian of St. Cecilia, John of St. Martin, and Guido of Crema, Cardinal of St. Callisto, were of the adverse faction, in close league with the imperial ambassadors, Otho Count Palatine,<sup>c</sup> and Guido Count of Blandrada. Octavian, prompted it is said by that ambassador, cried aloud Roland must not be compelled, and plucked the cope from his shoulders. The two others, the Cardinals Guido and of St. Martin, declared Octavian Pope; but a Roman senator who was present (the conclave then was an open court), indignant at his violence, seized the cope, and snatched it from the hand of Octavian. But Octavian's party were prepared for such an accident. His chaplain had another cope ready, in which he was invested with such indecent haste that,

<sup>b</sup> "Qui propter religionem suam cœpit se excusare secundum quod canones præcipiunt." The author of this B. Museum Chronicle adds that the partisans of Octavian had ready *venustissimum pallium*, p. 46. See on this Chronicle book x. ch. 4.

\* This must have been the Otho

who threatened to cut down the insolent Cardinal Roland at Besançon; Guido of Blandrada, the Emperor's favourite, whom Hadrian had refused to elevate to the archiepiscopate of Ravenna.—Epistola Canonice. apud Radovic., Otho Morena, Knoul de Rek. Ges. Frederic, Tristan Calchi.

as it was declared, by a manifest divine judgement, the front part appeared behind, the hinder part before. Upon this the assembly burst into derisive laughter. At that instant the gates, which had been closed, were forcibly broken open, a hired soldiery rushed in with drawn swords, and surrounding Octavian carried him forth in state. Roland (Alexander III.) and the cardinals of his faction were glad to escape with their lives, but reached a stronghold fortified and garrisoned for their reception near St. Peter's,<sup>a</sup> and for nine days they lay concealed and in security from their enemies. Octavian, in the mean time, assumed the name of Victor IV.: he was acknowledged as lawful Pope by a great part of the senators and people. The Frangipani then rallied the adverse party; Alexander was rescued from his imprisonment or blockade.

On the other side, Victor, and the Cardinals of his faction, thus relate the proceedings of the election. The Cardinals, when they entered the conclave, solemnly pledged themselves to proceed with calm deliberation, to ascertain the opinion of each with grave impartiality, not to proceed to the election without the general assent of all. But in a secret synod held at Anagni, during the lifetime of Hadrian, the anti-imperialist Cardinals, who had urged the pope to excommunicate Frederick, had taken an oath to elect one of their own party. This conspiracy was organised and maintained by the gold of William of Sicily. In direct infringement of the solemn compact, made before the commencement of the proceedings, they had suddenly by acclamation attempted to force the election of the Cardinal Roland. The division was of nine to fourteen; they acknow-

---

<sup>a</sup> It was called the “ munitio ecclesiae Sancti Petri.”

ledge themselves to have been the minority in numbers, but of course a minority of the wisest and best. While thus the nine protested against the violation of the agreement that the election was to be by general assent, the fourteen proceeded to invest Roland of Sienna. The nine then, at the petition of the Roman people, by the election of the whole clergy, the assent of almost all the senators, and of all the captains, barons, and nobles, both within and without the city, invested Victor IV. with the insignia of the popedom.

Rome was no safe place for either Pope ; each faction had its armed force, its wild and furious rabble. As Victor advanced to storm the stronghold near St. Peter's, occupied by his rival, he was hooted by the adverse mob : boys and women shouted and shrieked, called him by opprobrious names, “ heretic, blasphemer ! ” sung opprobrious verses, taunted him with the name of Octavian, so infamous in the history of the Popes ; a pasquinade was devised for the occasion in Latin verse.<sup>e</sup> On the eleventh day appeared Otho Frangipani and a party of the nobles, dispersed the forces of Victor, opened the gates of the stronghold, and led forth Alexander amid the acclamations of his partisans, but hurried him hastily away through the gates of the city.

Neither indeed of the rival Popes could venture on

<sup>e</sup> “ Clamabant pueri contra ipsum ecclesiæ invasorem, dicentes, Maledicte, fili maledicti ! dismanta, non eris Papa, non eris Papa ! Alexandrum volumus, quem Deus elegit. Mulieres quoque blasphemantes ipsum hæreticum et eadem verba ingeminabant, et alia derisoria verba decantabant. Accedens autem Brito quidam audacter dixit haec metrice :

‘ Quid factis, insane, patriæ mors, Octaviane  
Cur præsumpsisti tunicam dividere  
Christi ?  
Jam jam pulvis eris, modo vivis, cras  
moreris.’ ”

—Vit. ii. apud Muratori : S. R. I. iii. i. p. 419. Compare the Acta Vaticana apud Baronium. Victor is there called *Smarra compagnum*—I presume from the plucking the stole from the shoulders o' Alexander.

his consecration in Rome. Alexander was clad in the papal mantle at a place called the Cistern of Nero; <sup>f</sup> consecrated by the Bishop of Ostia at Nimfa, towards the Apulian frontier; Victor by the Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum and the Bishops of Nimfa and Ferentino, who had deserted the opposite party, in the monastery of Farfa. <sup>Sept. 24.</sup> <sup>Oct. 4.</sup>

The Emperor was besieging the city of Crema, when he received the intimation of this election from each of the rival Popes. He assumed the language of an impartial arbitrator: he summoned a council of all Christendom to meet at Pavia, and cited both the Popes to submit their claims to its decision. The summons to Alexander was addressed to the Cardinal Roland, the chancellor of the see of Rome.<sup>g</sup> Alexander refused to receive a mandate thus addressed, he protested against the right of the Emperor to summon a council without the permission of the Pope, nor would the Pope condescend to appear in the court of the Emperor to hear the sentence of an usurping tribunal. Victor, already sure of the favourable judgement, appeared with attestations of his lawful election

<sup>f</sup> This was not lost on the Victorians; the cistern of Nero was the place to which Nero had fled from the pursuing Romans; a fit place for people to show themselves "cisterns which could not hold water." "Undecimo (die) exierunt (a Româ) et pervenerunt ad Cisternam Neronis in qua latuit Nero fugiens Romanos insequentes. Juste Cisternam adierunt, quia deliquerunt fontem aquæ vivæ, et foderunt sibi cisternas, cisternas dissipatas, que continent non valent aquas. Et ibi die altero qui duodecimus erat ab electione

domini Victoris induerunt cancellarium stolam et pallium erroris, in destructionem et confusione ecclesiae, ibique primum cantaverunt; Te Deum laudamus."—Epist. Canon. S. Petri, apud Radovic. ii. 31. Each party avers of the other that he was *excratus*, not *consecratus*.

<sup>g</sup> According to the somewhat doubtful authority of John of Salisbury (Epist. 69), the Emperor's letter was addressed to Alexander as to Cardinal Roland, Chancellor of the Roman See to Victor as Pontiff.

from the Canons of St. Peter, and a great body of the clergy of Rome. The points which the party of Victor urged were, that Cardinal Roland had never been invested, according to his own admission, with the papal cope ; the consent or rather the initiative of the whole clergy and people of Rome in the election of Octavian ; the appearance of Roland after the election without the insignia of the Pope. The argument afterwards urged by the Emperor, was the disqualification of the Cardinals on account of their conspiracy, their premature election at Anagni during the lifetime of Hadrian. Neither Alexander, nor any one with authority to defend the cause of Alexander, appeared in the court. William of Pavia was silent.<sup>h</sup> The Council, after a grave debate and hearing of many witnesses (the Emperor had withdrawn to leave at least seeming Octave of the freedom to the ecclesiastics), with one accord Epiphany, <sup>A.D. 1160.</sup> declared Victor Pope, condemned and excommunicated the contumacious Cardinal of Sienna. To

Feb. 10. Victor the Emperor paid the customary  
Feb. 11. honours, held his stirrup and kissed his feet.<sup>i</sup>

Victor of course issued his excommunication of the Cardinal Roland. There was a secret cause behind, which no doubt strongly worked on the Emperor, through the Emperor on the council : letters of Alexander to the insurgent Lombard cities had been seized, and were in the hands of the Emperor.

The Archbishop of Cologne set out for France, the Bishop of Mantua to England, the Bishop of Prague to

<sup>h</sup> William of Pavia, Cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula, was afterwards accused by the wrathful Becket of betraying his master at Pavia.—Thom. Epist. ii. 21.

<sup>i</sup> Muratori is provoked by this schism from his usual calmness. “Rendè poscia Federigo a quest’ Idolo tutti gli onori, con tenergli la staffa, e baciargli i fetenti pieli.”—Sub ann.

Hungary, to announce the decision of the Council to Christendom, and to demand or persuade allegiance to Pope Victor.

Alexander did not shrink from the contest. At Anagni he issued his excommunication against the Emperor Frederick, the Antipope, and all his adherents.<sup>k</sup> He despatched his legates to all the kingdoms of Europe. His title was sooner or later acknowledged by France, Spain, England, Constantinople, Sicily, and Jerusalem, by the Cistercian and Carthusian monks. He struck a formidable blow against Frederick, now deeply involved in his mortal strife with the Lombard republics. His legate, the Cardinal John, found his way into Milan, and there in the presence and with the sanction of the martial Archbishop Uberto (the Archbishop had commanded on more than one occasion the cavalry of Milan), he published the excommunication of Octavian the Antipope, and Frederick the Emperor. A few days after, the same ban was pronounced against the Bishops of Mantua and Lodi and the consuls of all the cities in league with the Emperor.<sup>m</sup>

Thus the two Popes divided the allegiance of Christendom. France, Spain, England asserted Alexander. A council at Toulouse, representing France and England, had rejected the decision of the council of Pavia.<sup>n</sup> The Empire, Hungary, Bohemia, Norway, Sweden, submitted to Victor. Italy was divided: wherever the authority of the Emperor prevailed, Victor was recognised as the successor of St. Peter; wherever it was opposed, Alex-

<sup>k</sup> Radovic. ii. 22.

<sup>m</sup> Epist. Eberardo Archep. Saltzburg, April 1.

<sup>n</sup> Pope Alexander, knowing his

ground, condescended to appear by his representatives at this Council, though summoned by the kings of France and England.

ander. Sicily and Southern Italy were of Alexander's party. Each, Alexander at Anagni, Victor in Northern Italy, had uttered the last sentence of spiritual condemnation against his antagonist. From Anagni,

<sup>June 16-26.</sup> knowing that Frederick dared not withdraw

any strong force from the North of Italy, Alexander made a descent upon Rome, in order to add to the dignity of his cause by his possession of the capital city. He celebrated mass in the Lateran Church, and at Santa Maria Maggiore. But Rome, which would hardly endure the power of a Pope with undisputed authority, was no safe residence for one with a contested title. The turbulence of the people, the intrigues of the Antipope, the neighbourhood of some of the Germans in the fortresses around (all the patrimony of St. Peter but Civita Vecchia, Anagni, and Terracina was in their power),<sup>o</sup> the uncertainty of support from Sicily, which was now threatened with civil war, the humiliation of Milan, induced him to seek refuge in France. Leaving a representative of his authority, Julius, the Cardinal of St. John, he embarked on board a Sicilian fleet; Villani, Archbishop of Imperialist Pisa, had met him at Terracina in his galley.<sup>p</sup> After some danger, touching at Leghorn, and Porto Venere, the Archbishop conveyed him to Piombino, and rendered him the highest honours: from thence he reached Genoa; and having remained there a short time, landed on the coast of France, near Montpellier.<sup>q</sup> He was received everywhere with demonstrations of the utmost respect. There were some threatening appearances, a suspicious agreement, into which Louis had been betrayed, or had weakly con-

<sup>o</sup> Vit. Alexand. III.

<sup>p</sup> Marangoni, *Chronica Pisana*, p. 28.

<sup>q</sup> He disembarked near Montpellier, April, 1162; re-embarked at the same place, September, 1165.

sented to, that he would meet the Emperor Frederick at Lannes in Burgundy, each with his Pope, to decide the great controversy, or with the design of raising a third Pope; but this was an agreement which, neither being in earnest, each eluded with no great respect for veracity.<sup>r</sup> Yet, notwithstanding all this, the rival kings of France and England seemed to Soon after Christmas, 1161. forget their differences to pay honour to Alexander. He was met by both at Courcy on the Loire; Feb. 9, 1162. the two kings walked on either side of his horse, holding his bridle, and so conducted him into the town. There for above three years he dwelt, April 8. maintaining the state, and performing all the functions of a Pope in every part of Europe which acknowledged his sway. During his absence Frederick and Frederick's Pope seemed at first to be establishing their power beyond all chance of resistance throughout Italy. Milan fell,<sup>s</sup> and suffered the terrible vengeance of the Emperor; her walls were razed, her citizens dispersed. Sicily was a prey to civil factions, and it might seem to depend on the leisure or the caprice of Frederick, how soon he would subjugate the rest of Italy to his iron and absolute tyranny. But dark reverses were to come. Two years after the

<sup>r</sup> The whole account of this affair, in which appears the consummate weakness of Louis of France, at his first interview the slave of Alexander, and the adroit pliancy mingled with firmness of Pope Alexander, is in the *Hist. Veziliensis* (apud Duchesne, and in Guizot's *Collection des Mémoires*, vol. vii.) compared with *Vit. Alexandri*, apud Muratori. See Reuter, *Geschichte Alexander III.*, Berlin. The Protestant biographer is a thorough-going partisan

of the subject of his biography—almost as much overwrought as the convert Hurter by Innocent III.—and almost as high a Hildebrandine. He seems to me to estimate the character of Alexander, even from that point of view, much too highly.

<sup>s</sup> In the plunder of Milan the reliques of the three kings fell to the share of the Archbishop of Cologne: that city has ever since boasted of the holy spoil.—*Otto de Sanct. Blas.* cxvi.

departure of Alexander to France, the Antipope Victor died at Lucca. Guido of Crema was chosen, it was said by one Cardinal only, but by a large body of Lombard clergy, and took the name of Paschal III.

Death of  
Victor IV.  
April 20,  
1164.  
Paschal III  
April 22.

At this period the whole mind of Christendom was drawn away and absorbed by a contest in a remoter province of the Christian world, which for a time obscured, at least among the more religious, and all who were enthralled to the popular and dominant religion (in truth, the larger part of Europe), both the wars of monarchy and republicanism in Northern Italy, and the strife of Pope and Antipope. Neither Alexander III. nor Paschal III. in their own day occupied to such an extent the thoughts of the clergy and the laity throughout Christendom; the church has scarcely a Saint so speedily canonised after his death, so widely or so fervently worshipped as Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury. Nor was it only the personal character of the antagonists, or the circumstances of the strife, it was the great principle involved, comprehending as it did the whole authority and sanctity of the sacerdotal order, which gave this commanding interest to the new war between the spiritual and temporal powers. It was in England that this war was waged; on its event depended to a great degree the maintenance of the hierarchy, as a separate and privileged caste of mankind, subject to its own jurisdiction, and irresponsible but to its own superiors.

Our history, therefore, enters at length into this contest, not from pardonable nationality over-estimating its importance, but in the conviction that it is a chapter in the annals of Christianity indispensable to its completeness, general in its interest, and beyond almost all

others characteristic of its age. Nor is it insulated from the common affairs of Latin Christendom. Throughout, the history of Becket is in the closest connexion with that of Pope Alexander, and that of the Emperor Frederick and his Antipope. If not the fate of Becket, his support by Alexander III. depends on the variable fortunes of the Pope. While Alexander is in France (in which Henry of England had a wider dominion than the King of France) Becket is somewhat coldly urged to prudence and moderation. Still more when Alexander is returned to Italy. Then Becket's cause rises and falls with the Pope's prosperous or adverse fortunes : it depends on the predominance or the weakness of the Imperial power. The gold of England is the strength of Alexander. When Frederick is in the ascendant, and Henry threatens to withhold those supplies which maintain the Papal armies in the South, or the Papal interests in Milan and the Lombard cities ; or when Henry threatens to fall off to the Antipope ; Becket is well-nigh abandoned. Becket himself cannot disguise his indignation at the tergiversation of the Pope, the venality of the College of Cardinals. No sooner is Frederick's power on the wane ; no sooner has he suffered some of those fatal disasters which smote his authority, than Becket raises the song of triumph. He knows that Pope Alexander will now dare to support him to the utmost.

The Norman conquest of England was as total a revolution in the Church of the island as in the civil government and social condition. The Anglo-Saxon clergy, since the days of Dunstan, had produced no remarkable man. The triumph of monasticism had enfeebled without sanctifying the secular clergy ; it had spread over the island all its superstition, its thraldom of the mind, its reckless prodigality of lands and riches.

to pious uses, without its vigour, its learning, its industrial civilization. Like its faithful disciple, its humble acolyte, its munificent patron, Edward the Confessor, it might conceal much gentle and amiable goodness; but its outward character was that of timid and unworldly ignorance, unfit to rule, and exercising but feeble and unbeneficial influence over a population become at once more rude and fierce, and more oppressed and servile, by the Danish conquest. Its ignorance may have been exaggerated. Though it may have been true that hardly a priest from Trent to Thames understood Latin, that the services of the Church, performed by men utterly unacquainted with the ecclesiastical language, must have lost all solemnity; yet the Anglo-Saxons possessed a large store of vernacular Christian literature—poems, homilies, legends. They had begun to form an independent Teutonic Christianity. Equally wonderful was the multitude of their kings, who had taken the cowl, or on their thrones lived a monastic life and remained masters of wealth only to bestow it on the poor and on monasteries. The multitude of saints (no town was without its saint) was so numerous as to surpass all power of memory to retain them, and wanted writers to record them.<sup>t</sup>

The Normans were not only the foremost nation in arms, in personal strength, valour, enterprise, perseverance, and all the greater qualities of a military

---

<sup>t</sup> “De regibus dico qui pro amplitudine potestatis licenter indulgere voluptatibus possent; quorum quidam in patriâ, quidam Româ, mutato habitu, celeste lucrati sunt regnum, beatum nacti commercium: multi specie tenuis, totâ vitâ mundum amplexi; ut thesauros egenis effunderent, monasteriis dividerent. Quid dicam de tot episopis, heremitis, abbatibus. Nonne tota insula tantis reliquiis indigenarum fulgurat ut vix vicum aliquem prætereas, ubi novi sancti nomen non audias! quam multorum etiam perlit memoria, pro scriptorum inopia.”—Will. Malmes. p. 417, edit. Hist. Soc.

aristocracy : by a singular accident, it might be called, they possessed a seminary of the most learned and able churchmen. The martial, ambitious, unlearned Odo of Bayeux was no doubt the type of many of the Norman prelates ; of some of those on whom the Conqueror, when he built up his great system of ecclesiastical feudalism in the conquered land, bestowed some of the great sees in England, of which he had dispossessed the defeated Saxons. But from the same monastery of Bec came in succession two Primates of the Norman Church in England, in learning, sanctity, and general ability not inferior to any bishops of their time in Christendom — Lanfranc and Anselm. Lanfranc, to whom the Church had looked up as the most powerful antagonist of Berengar ; Anselm as the profound metaphysician, who was to retain as willing prisoners, within the pale of orthodoxy, those strong speculative minds which before, and afterwards during the days of Abé-lard, should venture into those dangerous regions.

The Abbey of Bec, as has been said, had been founded by a rude Norman knight, Herluin, in one of those strange accesses of devotion which suddenly changed men of the most uncongenial minds and most adverse habits into models of the most austere and almost furious piety. Herluin was as ignorant as he was rude ; his followers, who soon gathered round him, scarcely less so. But the monastery of Bec, before half a century had elapsed, was a seat of learning. Strangers who were wandering over Europe found that which was too often wanting in the richer and settled convents, seclusion and austerity. Such was the case with Lanfranc ; in the Abbey of Bec there was rigour enough to satisfy the most intense craving after self-torture. But the courtly Italian scholar was

Abbey of  
Bec.

not lost in the Norman monk. Lanfranc became at once a model of the severest austerity and the accomplished theologian, to whom Latin Christendom looked up as the champion of her vital doctrine. Lanfranc became Abbot of St. Stephen's at Caen.

The Norman Conqueror found that, although he had subjugated the Anglo-Saxon thanes and Anglo-Saxon people, he had not subjugated the Anglo-Saxon clergy. Notwithstanding the Papal benediction of the conquest of England, the manner in which Alexander II. openly espoused the cause, and the greater Hildebrand treated the kindred mind of the Conqueror with respect shown to no other monarch in Christendom, there was long a stubborn inert resistance, which with so superstitious a people might anywhere burst out into insurrection. As he had seized and confiscated the estates of the thanes, so the conqueror put into safer, into worthier hands, the great benefices of the Church. Lanfranc (there could be no wiser measure than to advance a man so famous for piety and learning throughout Christendom) was summoned to assume the primacy, from which the Conqueror, of his own will, though not without Papal sanction, had degraded the Anglo-Saxon Stigand. Lanfranc resisted, not only from monastic aversion to state and secular pursuits, but from unwillingness to rule a barbarous people, of whose language he was ignorant. Lanfranc yielded: he came as a Norman; his first act was to impose penance on the Anglo-Saxon soldiers who had dared to oppose William at Hastings; even on the archers whose bolts had flown at random, and did slay or might have slain Norman knights.

The Primate consummated the work of William in ejecting the Anglo-Saxon bishops and clergy. William would even proscribe their Saints: names unknown,

barbarous, which refused to harmonise with Latin, were ignominiously struck out of the calendar as unauthorised and intrusive. The Primate proceeded to the degradation of the holy Wulstan of Worcester. His crime was want of learning, ignorance of French, perhaps rather of Latin. Wulstan, the pride, the holy example of the Anglo-Saxon episcopate, appeared before the Synod : “From the first I knew my unworthiness. I was compelled to be a bishop : the clergy, the prelates, my master, by the authority of the Apostolic See, laid this burthen on my shoulder.” He advanced to the tomb of the Confessor ; he laid down his crosier on the stone : “Master, to thee only I yield up my staff.” He took his seat among the monks. The crosier remained embedded in the stone ; and this wonder, which might seem as if the Confessor approved the resignation, was interpreted the other way. Wulstan alone retained his see. The Anglo-Saxon secular clergy, notwithstanding the triumph of monasticism, the severe laws of Edgar, even of Canute, still clung to their right or usage of marriage. Lanfranc could disguise even to himself, as zeal against the married priests, his persecution of the Anglo-Saxon clergy.

A king so imperious as William, and a churchman so firm as Lanfranc, could hardly avoid collision. Though they scrupled not to despoil the Saxon prelates, the Church must suffer no spoliation. The estates of the See of Canterbury must pass whole and inviolable. The uterine brother of the King (his mother’s son by a second marriage), Odo the magnificent and able Bishop of Bayeux, his counsellor in peace, ever by his side in war, though he neither wore arms nor engaged in battle, had seized, as Count of Kent, twenty-five manors belonging to the Archiepiscopal

Odo of  
Bayeux

See.\* The Primate summoned the Bishop of Bayeux to public judgement on Penenden Heath; the award was in the Archbishop's favour. Still William honoured Lanfranc: Lanfranc, in the King's absence in Normandy, was chief justiciary, vicegerent within the realm. Lanfranc respected William. When the Conqueror haughtily rejected the demand of Hildebrand himself for allegiance and subsidy, we hear no remonstrance from the Primate. The Primate refused to go to Rome at the summons of the Pope. William Rufus, while Lanfranc lived, in some degree restrained his covetous encroachments on the wealth of the Church. Lanfranc had the prudence not to provoke the ungovernable King. But for five years after the death of Lanfranc Rufus would have no Primate, whose importunate control he thus escaped, while at the same time he converted to his own uses, without remonstrance, or at least without resistance, the splendid revenue of the see. Nothing but the wrath of God, as he supposed, during an illness which threatened his life, compelled him to place the

<sup>Anselm,  
Archbishop  
of Canter-  
bury.  
A.D. 1093.</sup> crosier in the hands of the meek, and, as he hoped, unworldly Anselm. It required as much violence in the whole nation, to whom Anselm's fame and virtues were so well known, to compel Anselm to accept the primacy, as to induce the King to bestow it.

But when Primate, Anselm, the monk, the philosopher, was as high, as impracticable a churchman as the boldest or the haughtiest. Anselm's was passive

\* Odo of Bayeux, according to *Malmesbury*, had even higher aspirations; his wealth, like Wolsey's, was designed to buy the Papacy itself. "In agerendis thesauris mirus, tergiversari miræ astutia; pene Papatum Romanum absens a civibus mercatus fuerit: peras peregrinorum epistolæ et nummis infarciens."—p. 457.

courage, Anselm's was gentle endurance ; but as unyielding, as impregnable, as that of Lanfranc, even of Hildebrand himself. No one concession could be wrung from him of property, of right, or of immunity belonging to his Church. He was a man whom no humiliation could humble : privation, even pain, he bore not only with the patience but with the joy of a monk. He was exiled : he returned the same meek, unoffending, unimpassioned man. His chief or first quarrel with Rufus was as to which of the Popes England should acknowledge. The Norman Anselm had before his advancement acknowledged Urban. It ended in Urban being the Pope of England. Nor was it with the violent rapacious Rufus alone that Anselm stood in this quiet, unconquerable oppugnancy ; the more prudent and politic Henry I. is committed in the same strife. It was now the question of Investitures. At Rome, during his first exile, Anselm was deeply impregnated with the Italian notions of Investiture, that "venomous source of all simony." But the Norman kings were as determined to assert their feudal supremacy as the Franconian or Hohenstaufen Emperors.

Anselm is again in Rome : the Pope Urban threatens to excommunicate the King of England ; Anselm interferes ; the King is not actually excommunicate, but the ban is on all his faithful counsellors. At length, after almost a life, at least almost an archiepiscopate, passed in this strife with the King, to whom in all other respects except as regards the property of the see and the rights of the Church, Anselm is the most loyal of subjects, the great dispute about Investitures comes to an end. The wise Henry I. has discovered that, by surrendering a barren ceremony, he may retain the substantial power. He consents to abandon the form

of granting the ring and pastoral staff; he retains the homage, and that which was the real object of the strife, the power of appointing to the wealthy sees and abbacies of the realm. The Church has the honour of the triumph; has wrung away the seeming concession; and Anselm, who in his unworldly views had hardly perhaps comprehended the real point at issue, has the glory and the conscious pride of success.

But the splendid and opulent benefices of the Anglo-Norman Church were too rich prizes to be bestowed on accomplished scholars, profound theologians, holy monks: the bishops at the close of Henry's reign are barons rather than prelates, their palaces are castles, their retainers vassals in arms. The wars between Stephen and the Empress Matilda are episcopal at least as much as baronial wars. It is the brother of Stephen, Henry Bishop of Winchester, the legate of the Pope, who is the author of Stephen's advancement. The citizens of London proclaim him: the coronation is at Winchester. The feeble Archbishop Theobald, the one less worldly prelate, yields to the commanding mind of the royal bishop. In the Council of Oxford it was openly declared that the right to elect the king was in the bishops.<sup>x</sup> The Bishop of Salisbury had two nephews, the Bishops of Lincoln and of Ely one of his sons (his sons by his concubine, Maud of Ramsbury) was Chancellor,<sup>y</sup> one Treasurer. Until the allegiance of the Bishops to Stephen wavered, the title of Matilda was hardly dangerous to the King. Stephen arrested the Bishops of Salisbury and Lincoln at Oxford, compelled them to surrender their strong castles of

<sup>x</sup> "Eorum majori parti cleri Angliae,

p. 746.

nd cuius jus potissimum spectat principem eligere, simulque ordinare." —

<sup>y</sup> "Qui nepos esse et plusquam nepos ferebatur."

Newark, Salisbury, Sherborne, and Malmesbury. The Bishop of Ely flew to arms, threw himself into Devizes; it was only the threat to hang up his nephew, which compelled him to capitulate.<sup>a</sup> It was a strange confusion. The whole of the bishops' castles, treasures, munitions of war, were seized into the King's hands; he held them in the most rigid and inexorable grasp;<sup>b</sup> yet at the same time Stephen did public penance for having dared to lay his impious hands on the "Christs of the Lord." The revolt of the Bishop of Ely was only the signal for the general war: Stephen was taken in the battle of Lincoln, his defeated army was under the walls of that city to chastise the Bishop. If Matilda's pride had not alienated Henry of Winchester, as her exactions did the citizens of London, she might have obtained at once full possession of the throne. It was in besieging the castle of the Bishop of Winchester in that city that Robert of Gloucester, the leader of her party, was attacked by the Londoners under the Bishop of Winchester in person, and was taken in his retreat to Bristol. The Archbishop Theobald, who had now espoused Matilda's cause, hardly escaped.

Such were the prelates of England just before the commencement of Henry II.'s reign: all, says a contemporary writer, or almost all, wearing arms, mingling in war, indulging in all the cruelties and exactions of war.<sup>b</sup> The lower clergy could hardly, with such examples, be otherwise than, too many of them, lawless

<sup>a</sup> *Gesta Stephani*, p. 50.

<sup>a</sup> *Ib.* p. 51.

<sup>b</sup> "Ipsi nihilominus, ipsi episcopi, quod pudet quidem dicere, non tamen omnes, sed plurimi ex omnibus, ferro accincti, armis instructi, cum patria

perversoribus superbissimis invicti equis, praedae participes, in milites bellici sorte interceptos vel pecuniosos quibuscumque occurrant vinculis et cruciatibus exponere," &c.—*Gesta Steph.* p. 99.

and violent men. Yet the Church demanded for the property and persons of such prelates and such clergy an absolute, inviolable sanctity. The seizure of their palaces, though fortified and garrisoned, was an invasion on the property of the Church. The seizure, maltreatment, imprisonment, far more any sentence of the law in the King's Courts upon their persons, was impiety, sacrilege.<sup>c</sup>

Such had been, not many years before, the state of the clergy in England, when broke out in England, and was waged for so many years, the great strife for the maintenance of the sacerdotal order as a peculiar caste of mankind, for its sole jurisdiction and its irresponsibility. Every individual in that caste, to its lowest doorkeeper, claimed an absolute immunity from capital punishment. The executioner in those ages sacrificed hundreds of common human lives to the terror of the law. The churchman alone, down to the most menial of the clerical body, stood above such law. The churchman too was judge without appeal in all causes of privilege or of property, which he possessed or in which he claimed the right of possession.

This strife was to be carried on with all the animation and interest of a single combat, instead of the long and confused conflict of order against order. Nor was it complicated with any of those intricate relations of the imperial and the papal power (the Emperor claiming to be the representative of the Cæsars of Rome, the Popes not only to be successors of the chief of the apostles, but also temporal sovereigns of Rome), which had drawn

<sup>c</sup> “Si episcopi tramitem justitiae in aliquo transgredierentur non esse regis sed canonum judicium : sine publico et ecclasiastico concilio illos nulla possesse privari posse.”—Malmesb. p. 719. The grant of these castles, when surrendered to laymen, was an invasion on Church property.

out to such interminable length the contest between the pontiffs and the houses of Franconia and Hohenstaufen. The champion of the civil power was Henry II. of England, a sovereign, at his accession, with the most extensive territories and least limited <sup>Henry II.</sup> power, with vast command of wealth, above any monarch of his time: a man of great ability, decision, and activity; of ungovernable passions, and intense pride, which did not prevent him from stooping to dissimulation, intrigue, and subtle policy. On the other hand, the Churchman, a subject of that <sup>Becket.</sup> sovereign, not of noble birth, but advanced by the grace of the king to the highest secular power; yet when raised by his own transcendant capacity and by the same misjudging favour to the height of ecclesiastical dignity, sternly and at once rending asunder all ties of attachment and gratitude, sacrificing the unbounded power and influence which he might have retained if he had still condescended to be the favourite of the king; an exile, yet so formidable as to be received not as a fugitive, but at once as a most valuable ally and an object of profound reverence by the King of France, and by other foreign princes. For seven years Becket inflexibly maintains his ground against the king and almost all the more powerful prelates of England, and some of Normandy. At times seemingly abandoned by the Pope himself, yet disdaining to yield, and rebuking even the Pope for his dastardly and temporising policy, he at length extorts his restoration to his see from the reluctant monarch. His barbarous assassination gave a temporary, perhaps, but complete triumph to his cause. The king, though not actually implicated in the murder, cannot avert the universal indignation but by the most humiliating submission, absolute prostration before

the sacerdotal power, and by public and ignominious penance. Becket was the martyr for the Church, and this not only in the first paroxysm of devotion, and not only with the clergy, whom the murder of a holy prelate threw entirely on his side, but with the whole people, to whom his boundless charities, his splendour, his sufferings, his exile, and the imposing austerity of his life had rendered him an object of awe and of love. He was the Saint whom the Church hastened to canonise, was compared in language, to us awfully profane, in his own time that of natural veneration, to the Saviour himself. The worship of Becket—and in those days it would be difficult to discriminate between popular worship and absolute adoration—superseded, not in Canterbury alone, nor in England alone, that of the Son of God, and even of his Virgin Mother.

Popular poetry, after the sanctification of Becket,  
<sup>Legend.</sup> delighted in throwing the rich colours of  
 marvel over his birth and parentage. It invented, or rather interwove with the pedigree of the martyr, one of those romantic traditions which grew out of the wild adventures of the crusades, and which occur in various forms in the ballads of all nations. That so great a saint should be the son of a gallant champion of the cross, and of a Saracen princess, was a fiction too attractive not to win general acceptance.<sup>4</sup> The father of Becket, so runs the legend, a gallant soldier, was a captive in the Holy Land, and inspired the daughter

<sup>4</sup> The early life of Becket has been mystified both by the imaginative tendencies of the age immediately following his own, and by the theorising tendencies of modern history. I shall shock some readers by unscrupulously

rejecting the tale of the Saracen princess; if ever there was an historic ballad, an unquestionable ballad; as well as the Saxon descent of Becket, as undeniably a historic fable.

of his master with an ardent attachment. Through her means he made his escape; but the enamoured princess could not endure life without him. She too fled and made her way to Europe. She had learned but two words of the Christian language, “London” and “Gilbert.” With these two magic sounds upon her lips she reached London; and as she wandered through the streets, constantly repeating the name of Gilbert, she was met by Becket’s faithful servant. Becket, as a good Christian, seems to have entertained religious scruples as to the propriety of wedding the faithful, but misbelieving, or, it might be, not sincerely believing maiden. The case was submitted to the highest authority, and argued before the Bishop of London. The issue was the baptism of the princess, by the name of Matilda (that of the empress queen), and their marriage in St. Paul’s with the utmost publicity and splendour.

But of this wondrous tale not one word had reached the ears of any of the seven or eight contemporary biographers of Becket, most of them his most intimate friends or his most faithful attendants.\* It was neither

\* There are no less than seven full contemporary, or nearly contemporary, Lives of Becket, besides fragments, legends, and “Passions.” Dr. Giles has reprinted, and in some respects enlarged, those works from the authority of MSS. I give them in the order of his volumes. I. *Vita Sancti Thomæ. Auctore Edward Grim.* II. *Auctore Roger de Pontiniaco.* III. *Auctore Willelmo Filio Stephani.* IV. *Auctoribus Joanne Decano Salisburiensi, et Alano Abbate Teuksburiensi.* V. *Auctore Willelmo Canterburyensi.* VI. *Auctore Anonymo Lambethensi.* VII. *Auctore Herberто de Bosham.* Of

these, Grim, Fitz-Stephen, and Herbert de Bosham were throughout his life in more or less close attendance on Becket. The learned John of Salisbury was his bosom friend and counsellor. Roger of Pontigny was his intimate associate and friend in that monastery. William was probably prior of Canterbury at the time of Becket’s death. The sixth professes also to have been witness to the death of Becket. (He is called Lambethensis by Dr. Giles, merely because the MS. is in the Lambeth Library.) Add to these the curious French poem, written five years after the murder of Becket, by Garnier of

known to John of Salisbury, his confidential adviser and correspondent, nor to Fitz-Stephen, an officer of his court in chancery, and dean of his chapel when archbishop, who was with him at Northampton, and at his death; nor to Herbert de Bosham, likewise one of his officers when chancellor, and his faithful attendant throughout his exile; nor to the monk of Pontigny, who waited upon him and enjoyed his most intimate confidence during his retreat in that convent; nor to Edward Grim, his standard-bearer, who, on his way from Clarendon, reproached him with his weakness, and having been constantly attached to his person, finally interposed his arm between his master and the first blow of the assassin. Nor were these ardent admirers of Becket silent from any severe aversion to the marvellous; they relate, with unsuspecting faith, dreams and prognostics which revealed to the mother the future greatness of her son, even his elevation to the see of Canterbury!'

To the Saxon descent of Becket, a theory in which, on the authority of an eloquent French writer,<sup>g</sup> modern history has seemed disposed to acquiesce, these biographers not merely give no support, but furnish direct contradiction. The lower people no doubt admired during his life, and worshipped after death, the blessed

Pont S. Maxence, partly published in the Berlin Transactions, by the learned Immanuel Bekker. All these, it must be remembered, write of the man; the later monkish writers, though near the time (Hoveden, Gervase, Diceto, Brompton), of the Saint.

<sup>f</sup> Brompton is not the earliest writer who recorded this tale; he took it from the *Quadrilogus I.*, but of this the late

is quite uncertain. The exact date of Brompton is unknown. See Preface in Twysden. He goes down to the end of Richard II.

<sup>g</sup> Mons. Thierry, *Hist. des Normands*. Lord Lyttelton (*Life of Henry II.*) had before asserted the Saxon descent of Becket: perhaps he misled M. Thierry.

Thomas of Canterbury, and the people were mostly Saxon. But it was not as a Saxon, but as a Saint, that Becket was the object of unbounded popularity during his life, of idolatry after his death.

The father of Becket, according to the distinct words of one contemporary biographer, was a native of Rouen, his mother of Caen.<sup>h</sup> Gilbert was no knight-errant, but a sober merchant, tempted by commercial advantages to settle in London: his mother neither boasted of royal Saracenic blood, nor bore the royal name of Matilda; she was the daughter of an honest burgher of Caen. His Norman descent is still further confirmed by his claim of relationship, or connexion at least, as of common Norman descent, with Archbishop Theobald.<sup>i</sup> The parents of Becket, he asserts himself, were merchants of unimpeached character, not of the lowest class. Gilbert Becket is said to have served the honourable office of sheriff, but his fortune was injured by fires, and other casualties.<sup>k</sup> The young Becket received his earliest education among the monks of Merton in Surrey, towards whom he cherished a fond attachment, and delighted to visit them in the days of his splendour. The dwelling of a respectable London merchant seems to have been a place where strangers of very different pursuits, who resorted to the metropolis of England, took up their lodging: and to Gilbert Becket's house

<sup>h</sup> The anonymous Lambethensis, after stating that many Norman merchants were allured to London by the greater mercantile prosperity, proceeds: "Ex horum numero fuit Gilbertus quidam cognomento Becket, patria Rotomagensis . . . habuit autem uxorem, nomine Roseam natione Cado-

mcensem, genere burgensem quoque non disparem."—Apud Giles, ii. p. 78.

<sup>i</sup> See below.

<sup>k</sup> "Quod si ad generis mei radicem et progenitores meos intenderis, cives quidem fuerunt Londonienses, in medio concivium suorum habitantes sive quærela, nec omnino infimi."—Epist. 130.

came persons both disposed and qualified to cultivate in various ways the extraordinary talents displayed by the youth, who was singularly handsome, and of engaging manners.<sup>m</sup> A knight, whose name, Richard de Aquila, occurs with distinction in the annals of the time, one of his father's guests, delighted in initiating the gay and spirited boy in chivalrous exercises, and in the chase with hawk and hound. On a hawking adventure the young Becket narrowly escaped being drowned in the Thames. At the same time, or soon after, he was inured to business by acting as clerk to a wealthy relative, Osborn Octuomini, and in the office of the Sheriff of London.<sup>n</sup> His accomplishments were completed by a short residence in Paris, the best school for the language spoken by the Norman nobility. To his father's house came likewise two learned civilians from Bologna, no doubt on some mission to the Archbishop of Canterbury. They were so captivated by young Becket, that they strongly recommended him to Archbishop Theobald, whom the father of Becket reminded of their common honourable descent from a knightly family near the town of Thiersy.<sup>o</sup> Becket was at once on the high road of advancement. His extraordinary abilities were cultivated by the wise patronage, and employed in the service of the primate. Once he accompanied that prelate to Rome;<sup>p</sup> and on more than one other occasion visited that great centre of Christian affairs. He was permitted to reside for a certain time at each of the great schools for the study

*In the  
household  
of the Arch-  
bishop.*

<sup>m</sup> Grim, p. 9. Pontiniac, p. 96.

<sup>n</sup> Grim, p. 8.

<sup>o</sup> "Eo familiarius, quod praefatus Gilbertus cum domino archipresule de propanquitate et genere loquebatur: ut

ille ortu Normannus et circa Thierici villam de equestri ordine natu vicinus."

—Fitz-Stephen, p. 184. Thiersy or Thierchville.

<sup>p</sup> Roger de Pontigni, p. 100.

of the canon law, Bologna and Auxerre.<sup>q</sup> He was not however, without enemies. Even in the court of Theobald began the jealous rivalry with Roger, afterwards Archbishop of York, then Archdeacon of Canterbury.<sup>r</sup> Twice the superior influence of the archdeacon obtained his dismissal from the service of Theobald; twice he was reinstated by the good offices of Walter, Bishop of Rochester. At length the elevation of Roger to the see of York left the field open to Becket. He was appointed to the vacant archdeaconry, the richest benefice, after the bishoprics, in England. From that time he ruled without rival in the favour of the aged Theobald. Preferments were heaped upon him by the lavish bounty of his patron.<sup>s</sup> During his exile he was reproached with his ingratitude to the king, who had raised him from poverty. "Poverty!" he rejoined; "even then I held the archdeaconry of Canterbury, the provostship of Beverley, a great many churches, and several prebends."<sup>t</sup> The trial and the triumph of Becket's precocious abilities was a negotiation of the utmost difficulty with the court of Rome. The first object was to obtain the legatine power for Archbishop Theobald; the second tended, more than almost all measures, to secure the throne of England to the house of Plantagenet. Archbishop Theobald, with his clergy, had inclined to the cause of Matilda and her son; they had refused to officiate at the coronation of Eustace, son of King Stephen. Becket not merely obtained from

<sup>q</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 185.

<sup>r</sup> According to Fitz-Stephen, Thomas was less learned (*minus literatus*) than his rival, but of loftier character and morals.—P. 184.

<sup>s</sup> "Plurimæ ecclesiæ, prebendæ

nonnullæ." Among the livings were one in Kent, and St. Mary le Strand; among the prebends, two at London and Lincoln. The archdeaconry of Canterbury was worth 100 pounds of silver a year. <sup>t</sup> Epist. 180.

Eugenius III. the full papal approbation of this refusal, but a condemnation of Stephen (whose title had before been sanctioned by Eugenius himself) as a perjured usurper.<sup>a</sup>

But on the accession of Henry II., the aged Archbishop began to tremble at his own work; serious apprehensions arose as to the disposition of the young king towards the Church. His connexion was but remote with the imperial family (though his mother had worn the imperial crown, and some imperial blood might flow in his veins); but the Empire was still the implacable adversary of the papal power. Even from his father he might have received an hereditary taint of hatred to the Church, for the Count of Anjou had on many occasions shown the utmost hostility to the Hierarchy, and had not scrupled to treat churchmen of the highest rank with unexampled cruelty. In proportion as it was important to retain a young sovereign of such vast dominions in allegiance to the Church, so was it alarming to look forward to his disobedience. The Archbishop was anxious to place near his person some one who might counteract this suspected perversity, and to prevent his young mind from being alienated from the clergy by fierce and lawless counsellors. He had discerned not merely unrivalled abilities, but with prophetic sagacity, his Archdeacon's lofty and devoted churchmanship. Through the recommendation of the primate, Becket was raised to the dignity of chancellor,<sup>x</sup> an office which made him the

<sup>a</sup> Lord Lyttelton gives a full account of this transaction.—Book i. p. 213.

<sup>x</sup> This remarkable fact in Becket's history rests on the authority of his friend, John of Salisbury: “Erat

enim in suspectu adolescentia regis et juvenum et pravorum hominum, quorum conciliis agi videbatur . . . insipientiam et malitiam formidabat . . . cancellarium procurata in curia

second civil power in the realm, inasmuch as his seal was necessary to countersign all royal mandates. Nor was it without great ecclesiastical influence, as in the chancellor was the appointment of all the royal chaplains, and the custody of vacant bishoprics, abbacies, and benefices.<sup>y</sup>

But the Chancellor, who was yet, with all his great preferments, only in deacon's orders, might seem disdainfully to throw aside the habits, feelings, restraints of the churchman, and to aspire, as to the plenitude of secular power, so to unprecedented secular magnificence.<sup>z</sup> Becket shone out in all the graces of an accomplished courtier, in the bearing and valour of a gallant knight; though at the same time he displayed the most consummate abilities for business, the promptitude, diligence, and prudence of a practised statesman. The beauty of his person, the affability of his manners, the extraordinary acuteness of his senses,<sup>a</sup> his activity in all chivalrous exercises, made him the chosen companion of the king in his constant diversions, in the chase and in the mimic war, in all but his debaucheries. The king would willingly have lured the Chancellor into this companionship likewise; but the silence of his bitterest enemies, in confirmation of his

ordinari, cuius ope et opera novi regis ne s̄eviret in ecclesiam, impetum cohiberet et consilii sui temperaret malitiam."—Apud Giles, p. 321. This is repeated in almost the same words by William of Canterbury, vol. ii. p. 2. Compare what may be read almost as the dying admonitions of Theobald to the king: "Suggerunt vobis filii saeculi hujus, ut ecclesie minuatis auctoritatem, ut vobis regni dignitas augeatur." He had before said, "Cui

deest gratia Ecclesie, tota creatrix Trinitas adversatur."—Apud Bouquet, xvi. p. 504. Also Roger de Pontigny, p. 101.

<sup>y</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 186. Compare on the office of chancellor Lord Campbell's Life of Becket.

<sup>z</sup> De Bosham, p. 17.

<sup>a</sup> See a curious passage on the singular sensitiveness of his hearing, and even of his smell.—Roger de Pontigny p. 98.

own solemn protestations, may be admitted as conclusive testimonies to his unimpeached morals.<sup>b</sup> The power of Becket throughout the king's dominions equalled that of the king himself—he was king in all but name: the world, it was said, had never seen two friends so entirely of one mind.<sup>c</sup> The well-known anecdote best illustrates their intimate familiarity. As they rode through the streets of London on a bleak winter day they met a beggar in rags. "Would it not be charity," said the king, "to give that fellow a cloak and cover him from the cold?" Becket assented; on which the king plucked the rich furred mantle from the shoulders of the struggling Chancellor and threw it, to the amazement and admiration of the bystanders, no doubt to the secret envy of the courtiers at this proof of Becket's favour, to the shivering beggar.<sup>d</sup>

But it was in the graver affairs of the realm that Henry derived still greater advantage from the wisdom and the conduct of the Chancellor.<sup>e</sup> To Becket's counsels his admiring biographers attribute the pacification of the kingdom, the expulsion of the foreign mercenaries who during the civil wars of Stephen's reign had devastated the land and had settled down as conquerors, especially in Kent, the humiliation of the refractory barons and the demolition of their castles. The peace was so profound that merchants could travel everywhere

<sup>b</sup> Roger de Pontigny, p. 104. His character by John of Salisbury is remarkable: "Erat supra modum captator auræ popularis . . . etsi superbus esset et vanus et interdum faciem prætendebat insipiente amantium et verba proferret, admirandus tamen et imitandus erat in corporis castitate."—P. 320. See an adventure related by William of Canterbury, p. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Grim, p. 12. Roger de Pontigny, p. 102. Fitz-Stephen, p. 192.

<sup>d</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 191. Fitz-Stephen is most full and particular on the chancellorship of Becket.

<sup>e</sup> It is not quite clear how soon after the accession of Henry the appointment of the Chancellor took place. I should incline to the earlier date, A.D. 1155.

in safety, and even the Jews collect their debts.<sup>f</sup> The magnificence of Becket redounded to the glory of his sovereign. In his ordinary life he was sumptuous beyond precedent; he kept an open table, where those who were not so fortunate as to secure a seat at the board had clean rushes strewn on the floor, on which they might repose, eat, and carouse at the Chancellor's expense. His household was on a scale vast even for that age of unbounded retainership, and the haughtiest Norman nobles were proud to see their sons brought up in the family of the merchant's son. In his embassy to Paris to demand the hand of the Princess Margaret for the king's infant son, described with such minute accuracy by Fitz-Stephen,<sup>g</sup> he outshone himself, yet might seem to have a loyal rather than a personal aim in this unrivalled pomp. The French crowded from all quarters to see the splendid procession pass, and exclaimed, "What must be the king, whose Chancellor can indulge in such enormous expenditure?"

Even in war the Chancellor had displayed not only the abilities of a general, but a personal prowess, which, though it found many precedents in those times, might appear somewhat incongruous in an ecclesiastic, who yet held all his clerical benefices. In the expedition made by King Henry to assert his right to the dominions of the Counts of Toulouse, Becket appeared at the head of seven hundred knights who did him service, and foremost in every adventurous exploit was the valiant Chancellor. Becket's bold counsel urged the immediate storming of the city, which would have been followed by the captivity of the King of

Ambassador  
to Paris.  
A.D. 1160.

France. Henry, in whose character impetuosity was strangely moulded up with irresolution, dared not risk this violation of feudal allegiance, the captivity of his suzerain. The event of the war showed the policy as well as the superior military judgement of the warlike Chancellor. At a period somewhat later, Becket, who was left to reduce certain castles which held out against his master, unhorsed in single combat and took prisoner a knight of great distinction, Engelran de Trie. He returned to Henry in Normandy at the head of 1200 knights and 4000 stipendiary horsemen, raised and maintained at his own charge. If indeed there were grave churchmen even in those days who were revolted by these achievements in an ecclesiastic (he was still only in deacon's orders), the sentiment was by no means universal, nor even dominant. With some his valour and military skill only excited more ardent admiration. One of his biographers bursts out into this extraordinary panegyric on the Archdeacon of Canterbury : "Who can recount the carnage, the desolation, which he made at the head of a strong body of soldiers ? He attacked castles, razed towns and cities to the ground, burned down houses and farms without a touch of pity, and never showed the slightest mercy to any one who rose in insurrection against his master's authority."<sup>h</sup>

The services of Becket were not unrewarded ; the love and gratitude of his sovereign showered honours and emoluments upon him. Among his grants were the wardenship of the Tower of London, the lordship of the castle of Berkhamstead and the honour of Eye, with the service of a hundred and forty knights. Yet there must have been other and more prolific sources

<sup>h</sup> Edward Grim, p. 12.

of his wealth, so lavishly displayed. Through his hands as Chancellor passed almost all grants and royal favours. He was the guardian of all <sup>Wealth of Becket.</sup> escheated baronies and of all vacant benefices. It is said in his praise that he did not permit the king, as was common, to prolong those vacancies for his own advantage, that they were filled up with as much speed as possible; but it should seem, by subsequent occurrences, that no very strict account was kept of the king's monies spent by the Chancellor in the king's service and those expended by the Chancellor himself. This seems intimated by the care which he took to secure a general quittance from the chief justiciary of the realm before his elevation to the archbishopric.

But if in his personal habits and occupations Becket lost in some degree the churchman in the secular dignitary, was he mindful of the solemn trust imposed upon him by his patron the archbishop, and true to the interests of his order? Did he connive at, or at least did he not resist, any invasion on ecclesiastical immunities, or, as they were called, the liberties of the clergy? Did he hold their property absolutely sacred? It is clear that he consented to levy the scutage, raised on the whole realm, on ecclesiastical as well as secular property. All that his friend John of Salisbury can allege in his defence is, that he bitterly repented of having been the minister of this iniquity.<sup>1</sup> "If with

---

<sup>1</sup> John of Salisbury denies that he sanctioned the rapacity of the king, and urges that he only yielded to necessity. Yet his exile was the just punishment of his guilt. "Tamen quia eum ministrum fuisse iniquitatis non ambigo, jure optimo taliter arbitror puniendum ut eo potissimum puniatur auctore, quem in talibus Deo bonorum omnium auctori præferebat. . . . . Sed esto: nunc penitentiam agit, agnoscit et confitetur culpam pro ea, et si cum Saulo quandoque ecclesiam impugnavit, nunc, cum Paulo ponere paratus est animam suam."—Bouquet p. 518.

Saul he persecuted the Church, with Paul he is prepared to die for the Church." But probably the worst effect of this conduct as regards King Henry was the encouragement of his fatal delusion that, as archbishop, Becket would be as submissive to his wishes in the affairs of the Church as had been the pliant Chancellor. It was the last and crowning mark of the royal confidence that Becket was entrusted with the education of the young Prince Henry, the heir to all the dominions of the king.

Six years after the accession of Henry II. died <sup>April, 1161.</sup> Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury. On the character of his successor depended the peace of the realm, especially if Henry, as no doubt he did, already entertained designs of limiting the exorbitant power of the Church. Becket, ever at his right hand, could not but occur to the mind of the king. Nothing in his habits of life or conduct could impair the hope that in him the loyal, the devoted, it might seem unscrupulous subject, would predominate over the rigid churchman. With such a prime minister, attached by former benefits, it might seem by the warmest personal love, still more by this last proof of boundless confidence, to his person, and as holding the united offices of Chancellor and Primate, ruling supreme both in Church and State, the king could dread no resistance, or if there were resistance, could subdue it without difficulty.

Rumour had already designated Becket as the future primate. A churchman, the Prior of Leicester, on a visit to Becket, who was ill at Rouen, pointing to his apparel, said, "Is this a dress for an Archbishop of Canterbury?" Becket himself had not disguised his hopes and fears. "There are three poor priests in England,

any one of whose elevation to the see of Canterbury I should wish rather than my own. I know the very heart of the king; if I should be promoted, I must forfeit his favour or that of God."<sup>k</sup>

The king did not suddenly declare his intentions. The see was vacant for above a year,<sup>m</sup> and the administration of the revenues must have been in the department of the Chancellor. At length as Becket, who had received a commission to return to England on other affairs of moment, took leave of his sovereign at Falaise, Henry hastily informed him that those affairs were not the main object of his mission to England—it was for his election to the vacant archbishopric. Becket remonstrated, but in vain; he openly warned, it is said, his royal master that as Primate he must choose between the favour of God and that of the king—he must prefer that of God.<sup>n</sup> In those days the interests of the clergy and of God were held inseparable. Henry no doubt thought this but the decent resistance of an ambitious prelate. The advice of Henry of Pisa, the Papal Legate, overcame the faint and lingering scruples of Becket: he passed to England with the king's recommendation, mandate it might be called, for his election.

All which to the king would designate Becket as the

<sup>k</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 193.

<sup>m</sup> Theobald died April 18, 1161. Becket was ordained priest and consecrated on Whitsunday, 1162.

<sup>n</sup> Yet Theobald, according to John of Salisbury, designed Becket for his successor,—

<sup>\*</sup> hunc (i. e. Becket Cancellarium) successurum sibi sperat et orat,  
Hic est carmineum qui jus cancellat ini-  
quum.

Quos habuit reges Anglia capta diu,  
Eesse putans reges, quos est perpresso,  
tyrannos  
Plus veneratur eos, qui nocuerunt magis."—  
*Enthousias, l. 1295.*

Did Becket decide against the Norman laws by the Anglo-Saxon? Has any one guessed the meaning of the rest of John's verses on the chancellor and his Court? I confess myself baffled.

future primate could not but excite the apprehensions of the more rigorous churchmen. The monks of Canterbury, with whom rested the formal election, alleged as an insuperable difficulty that Becket had never worn the monastic habit, as almost all his predecessors had done.\* The suffragan bishops would no doubt secretly resist the advancement, over all their heads, of a man who, latterly at least, had been more of a soldier, a courtier, and a lay statesman. Nor could the prophetic sagacity of any but the wisest discern the latent churchmanship in the ambitious and inflexible heart of Becket. It is recorded on authority, which I do not believe doubtful as to its authenticity, but which is the impassioned statement of a declared enemy, that nothing but the arrival of the great justiciary, Richard de Lucy, with the king's peremptory commands, and with personal menaces of proscription and exile against the more forward opponents, awed the refractory monks and prelates to submission.

At Whitsuntide Thomas Becket received priest's orders, and was then consecrated Primate of England with great magnificence in the Abbey of Westminster. The see of London being vacant, the ceremony was performed by the once turbulent, now aged and peaceful, Henry of Winchester, the brother of King Stephen. One voice alone, that of Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of Hereford,<sup>p</sup> broke the apparent harmony by a bitter sarcasm

\* Roger de Pontigny, p. 100.

<sup>p</sup> In the memorable letter of Gilbert Foliot. Dr. Lingard observes that Mr. Berington has proved this letter to be spurious. I cannot see any force in Mr. Berington's arguments, and should certainly have paid more deference to Dr. Lingard himself if he had examined

the question. It seems, moreover (if I rightly understand Dr. Giles, and I am not certain that I do), that it exists in more than one MS. of Foliot's letters. He has printed it as unquestioned; no very satisfactory proceeding in an editor. The conclusive argument for its authenticity with me is this: Who,

—“The king has wrought a miracle ; he has turned a soldier and a layman into an archbishop.” Gilbert Foliot.  
 Gilbert Foliot, from first to last the firm and unawed antagonist of Becket, is too important a personage to be passed lightly by.<sup>4</sup> This sally was attributed no doubt by some at the time, as it was the subject afterwards of many fierce taunts from Becket himself, and of lofty vindication by Foliot, to disappointed ambition, as though he himself aspired to the primacy. Nor was there an ecclesiastic in England who might entertain more just hopes of advancement. He was admitted to be a man of unimpeachable life, of austere habits, and great learning. He had been Abbot of Gloucester and then Bishop of Hereford. He was in correspondence with four successive Popes, Coelestine II., Lucius II., Eugenius III., Alexander, and with a familiarity which implies a high estimation for ability and experience. He is interfering in matters remote from his diocese, and commanding other bishops, Lincoln and Salisbury, to the favourable consideration of the Pontiff. All his letters reveal as imperious and conscientious a churchman as Becket himself, and in Becket’s position Foliot might have resisted the king as inflexibly.<sup>5</sup> He was, in short, a bold and stirring ecclesiastic, who did not scruple to wield, as he had done in several instances, that last terrible weapon of the clergy which burst on

after Becket’s death and canonisation, would have ventured or thought it worth while to forge such a letter? To whom was Foliot’s memory so dear, or Becket’s so hateful, as to reopen the whole strife about his election and his conduct? Besides, it seems clear that it is either a rejoinder to the long letter addressed by Becket to the clergy of England (Giles, iii. 170), or that

letter is a rejoinder to Foliot’s. Each is a violent party pamphlet against the other, and of great ability and labour.

\* Foliot’s nearest relatives, if not himself, were Scotch; one of them had forfeited his estate for fidelity to the King of Scotland.—Epist. ii. cclxxviii.

\* Read his letters before his elevation to the see of London.

his own head, excommunication.<sup>s</sup> It may be added that, notwithstanding his sarcasm, there was no open breach between him and Becket. The primate acquiesced in, if he did not promote, the advancement of Foliot to the see of London;<sup>t</sup> and during that period letters of courtesy which borders on adulation were interchanged at least with apparent sincerity.<sup>u</sup>

The king had indeed wrought a greater miracle than himself intended, or than Foliot thought possible. Becket became at once not merely a decent prelate, but an austere and mortified monk : he seemed determined to make up for his want of ascetic qualifications ; to crowd a whole life of monkhood into a few years.<sup>x</sup> Under his canonical dress he wore a monk's frock, hair-cloth next his skin ; his studies, his devotions, were long, regular, rigid. At the mass he was frequently melted into passionate tears. In his outward demeanour, indeed, though he submitted to private flagellation, and the most severe macerations, Becket was still the stately prelate ; his food, though scanty to abstemiousness, was, as his constitution required, more delicate, his charities were boundless. Archbishop Theobald had

<sup>s</sup> See, e. g., Epist. cxxxii., in which he informs Archbishop Theobald that the Earl of Hereford held intercourse with William Beauchamp, excommunicated by the Primate. "Vilescit anathematis authoritas, nisi et communicaentes excommunicatis corripiat digna severitas." The Earl of Hereford must be placed under anathema.

<sup>t</sup> Lambeth. p. 91. The election of the Bishop of Hereford to London is confirmed by the Pope's permission to elect him (March 19) rogatu H. regis et Archep. Cantuensis. A letter from

Pope Alexander on his promotion rebukes him for *fasting too severely*.—Epist. cclix.

<sup>u</sup> Foliot, in a letter to Pope Alexander, maintains the superiority of Canterbury over York.—cxlix.

<sup>x</sup> See on the change in his habits, Lambeth. p. 84; also the strange story, in Grim, of a monk who declared himself commissioned by a preterhuman person of terrible countenance to warn the Chancellor not to dare to appear in the choir, as he had done, in a secular dress.—p. 16.

doubled the usual amount of the primate's alms, Becket again doubled that; and every night in privacy, no doubt more ostentatious than the most public exhibition, with his own hands he washed the feet of thirteen beggars. His table was still hospitable and sumptuous, but instead of knights and nobles, he admitted only learned clerks, and especially the regulars, whom he courted with the most obsequious deference. For the sprightly conversation of former times were read grave books in the Latin of the church.

But the change was not alone in his habits and mode of life. The King could not have reproved, he might have admired, the most punctilious regard for the decency and the dignity of the highest ecclesiastic in the realm. But the inflexible churchman began to betray himself in more unexpected acts. While still in France Henry was startled at receiving a peremptory resignation of the chancellorship, as inconsistent with the religious functions of the primate. This act was as it were a bill of divorce from all personal intimacy with the king, a dissolution of their old familiar and friendly intercourse. It was not merely that the holy and austere prelate withdrew from the unbecoming pleasures of the court, the chase, the banquet, the tournament, even the war; they were no more to meet at the council board, and the seat of judicature. It had been said that Becket was co-sovereign with the king, he now appeared (and there were not wanting secret and invidious enemies to suggest, and to inflame the suspicion) a rival sovereign.<sup>y</sup> The king, when Becket met him on his landing at

---

<sup>y</sup> Compare the letter of the politic Arnulf, Bishop of Lisieux: "Si enim etiam magis quam olim, Principe con-favori divino favorem præferretis regnare." — Apud Bouquet, xvi. p. humanum, poteratis non solum cum 129.

Southampton, did not attempt to conceal his dissatisfaction ; his reception of his old friend was cold.

It were unjust to human nature to suppose that it did not cost Becket a violent struggle, a painful sacrifice, thus as it were to rend himself from the familiarity and friendship of his munificent benefactor. It was no doubt a severe sense of duty which crushed his natural affections, especially as vulgar ambition must have pointed out a more sure and safe way to power and fame. Such ambition would hardly have hesitated between the ruling all orders through the king, and the solitary and dangerous position of opposing so powerful a monarch to maintain the interests and secure the favour of one order alone.

Henry was now fully occupied with the affairs of Wales. Becket, with the royal sanction, obeyed the summons of Pope Alexander to the Council of Tours. Becket had passed through part of France at the head of an army of his own raising, and under his command ; he had passed a second time as representing the king, <sup>Becket at</sup> <sub>Tours.</sub> where Pope Alexander now held his court, and presided over his Council, May 19, 1163. Becket appeared at the head of all the Bishops of England, except those excused on account of age or infirmity. So great was his reputation, that the Pope sent out all the cardinals, except those in attendance on his own person, to escort the primate of England into the city. In the council at Tours not merely was the title of Alexander to the popedom avouched with perfect unanimity, but the rights and privileges of the clergy asserted with more than usual rigour and distinctness. Some canons, one especially which severely condemned all encroachments on the property of the Church, might seem

framed almost with a view to the impending strife with England.

That strife, so impetuous might seem the combatants to join issue, broke out, during the next year, <sup>Beginning of strife.</sup> in all its violence. Both parties, if they did not commence, were prepared for aggression. The first occasion of public collision was a dispute concerning the customary payment of the ancient Danegelt, of two shillings on every hide of land, to the sheriffs of the several counties. The king determined to transfer this payment to his own exchequer: he summoned an assembly at Woodstock, and declared his intentions. All were mute but Becket; the archbishop opposed the enrolment of the decree, on the ground that the tax was voluntary, not of right. "By the eyes of God," said Henry, his usual oath, "it shall be enrolled!" "By the same eyes, by which you swear," replied the prelate, "it shall never be levied on my lands while I live!"<sup>z</sup> On Becket's part, almost the first act of his primacy was to vindicate all the rights, and to resume all the property which had been usurped, or which he asserted to have been usurped, from his see.<sup>x</sup> It was not likely that, in the turbulent times just gone by, there would have been rigid respect for the inviolability of sacred property. The title of the Church was held to be indefeasible. Whatever had once belonged to the Church might be recovered at any time; and the ecclesiastical courts claimed the sole right of adjudication in

---

<sup>x</sup> This strange scene is recorded by Roger de Pontigny, who received his information on all those circumstances from Becket himself, or from his followers. See also Grim, p. 22.

up the rich archdeaconry of Canterbury, which he seemed disposed to hold with the archbishopric. Geoffrey Ridel, who became archdeacon, was afterwards one of his most active enemies.

<sup>z</sup> Becket had been compelled to give

such causes. The primate was thus at once plaintiff, judge, and carried into execution his own judgements. The lord of the manor of Eynsford in Kent, who held of the king, claimed the right of presentation to that benefice. Becket asserted the prerogative of the see of Canterbury. On the forcible ejectment of his nominee by the lord, William of Eynsford, Becket proceeded at once to a sentence of excommunication, without regard to Eynsford's feudal superior the king. The primate next demanded the castle of Tunbridge from the head of the powerful family of De Clare; though it had been held by De Clare, and it was asserted, received in exchange for a Norman castle, since the time of William the Conqueror. The attack on De Clare might seem a defiance of the whole feudal nobility; a determination to despoil them of their conquests, or grants from the sovereign.

<sup>Claims of Becket.</sup> The king, on his side, wisely chose the strongest and more popular ground of the immunities of the clergy from all temporal jurisdiction. He appeared as guardian of the public morals, as administrator of equal <sup>Immunities of the clergy.</sup> justice to all his subjects, as protector of the peace of the realm. Crimes of great atrocity, it is said, of great frequency, crimes such as robbery and homicide, crimes for which secular persons were hanged by scores and without mercy, were committed almost with impunity, or with punishment altogether inadequate to the offence, by the clergy; and the sacred name of clerk, exempted not only bishops, abbots, and priests, but those of the lowest ecclesiastical rank from the civil power. It was the inalienable right of the clerk to be tried only in the court of his bishop; and as that court could not award capital punishment, the utmost penalties were flagellation, imprisonment, and degradation. It

was only after degradation, and for a second offence (for the clergy strenuously insisted on the injustice of a second trial for the same act),<sup>b</sup> that the meanest of the clerical body could be brought to the level of the most highborn layman. But to cede one tittle of these immunities, to surrender the sacred person of a clergyman, whatever his guilt, to the secular power, was treason to the sacerdotal order: it was giving up Christ (for the Redeemer was supposed actually to dwell in the clerk, though his hands might be stained with innocent blood) to be crucified by the heathen.<sup>c</sup> To mutilate the person of one in holy orders was directly contrary to the Scripture (for with convenient logic, while the clergy rejected the example of the Old Testament as to the equal liability of priest and Levite with the ordinary Jew to the sentence of the law, they alleged it on their own part as unanswerable). It was inconceivable, that hands which had but now made God should be tied behind the back, like those of a common malefactor, or that his neck should be wrung on a gibbet, before whom kings had but now bowed in reverential homage.<sup>d</sup>

The enormity of the evil is acknowledged by Becket's most ardent partisans.<sup>e</sup> The king had credible infor-

<sup>b</sup> The king was willing that the clerk guilty of murder or robbery should be degraded before he was hanged, but hanged he should be. The archbishop insisted that he should be safe "a *laesione membrorum*." Degradation was in itself so dreadful a punishment, that to hang also for the same crime was a double penalty. "If he returned to his vomit," after degradation, "he might be hanged."—Compare Grim, p. 30.

<sup>c</sup> "De novo judicatur Christus ante

Pilatum praesidem." — De Bosham, p. 117.

<sup>d</sup> De Bosham, p. 100.

<sup>e</sup> The fairness with which the question is stated by Herbert de Bosham, the follower, almost the worshipper of Becket, is remarkable. "Arctabatur itaque rex, arctabatur et pontifex. Rex etenim populi sui pacem, sicut archipresul cleri sui zelans libertatem, audiens sic et videns et ad multorum relationes et querimonias accipiens, per hujuscemodi castigationes, talium cleri

mation laid before him that some of the clergy were absolute devils in guilt, that their wickednesses could not be repressed by the ordinary means of justice, and were daily growing worse.

Becket himself had protected some notorious and heinous offenders. A clerk of the diocese of Worcester had debauched a maiden and murdered her father. Becket ordered the man to be kept in prison, and refused to surrender him to the king's justice.<sup>1</sup> Another in London, guilty of stealing a silver goblet, was claimed as only amenable to the ecclesiastical court. Philip de Brois, a canon of Bedford, had been guilty of homicide. The cause was tried in the bishop's court; he was condemned to pay a fine to the kindred of the slain man. Some time after, Fitz-Peter, the king's justiciary, whether from private enmity or offence, or dissatisfied with the ecclesiastical verdict, in the open court at Dunstable, called De Brois a murderer. De Brois broke out into angry and contumelious language against the judge. The insult to the justiciary was held to be insult to the king, who sought justice, where alone he could obtain it, in the bishop's court. Philip de Brois this time incurred a sentence, to our notions almost as disproportionate as that for his former offence. He was condemned to be publicly whipped, and degraded for two years from the honours and emoluments of his canonry. But to the

corum immo verius characterizatorum, demonum flagitia non reprimi vel potius indies per regnum deterius fieri." He proceeds to state at length the argument on both sides. Another biographer of Becket makes strong admissions of the crimes of the clergy: "Sed et ordinatorum inordinati mores, inter regem et archiepiscopum auxere

malitiam, qui solito abundantius per idem tempus apparebant publicis irrestiti criminibus."—Edw. Grim. It was said that no less than 100 of the clergy were charged with homicide.

This, according to Fitz-Stephen, was the first cause of quarrel with the king, p. 215.

king the verdict appeared far too lenient; the spiritual jurisdiction was accused as shielding the criminal from his due penalty.

Such were the questions on which Becket was prepared to confront and to wage war to the death with Character of the King. the king; and all this with a deliberate know-

ledge both of the power and the character of Henry, his power as undisputed sovereign of England and of continental territories more extensive and flourishing than those of the king of France. These dominions included those of the Conqueror and his descendants, of the Counts of Anjou, and the great inheritance of his wife, Queen Eleanor, the old kingdom of Aquitaine; they reached from the borders of Flanders round to the foot of the Pyrenees. This almost unrivalled power could not but have worked with the strong natural passions of Henry to form the character drawn by a churchman of great ability, who would warn Becket as to the formidable adversary whom he had undertaken to oppose,— “ You have to deal with one on whose policy the most distant sovereigns of Europe, on whose power his neighbours, on whose severity his subjects look with awe; whom constant successes and prosperous fortune have rendered so sensitive, that every act of disobedience is a personal outrage; whom it is as easy to provoke as difficult to appease; who encourages no rash offence by impunity, but whose vengeance is instant and summary. He will sometimes be softened by humility and patience, but will never submit to compulsion; everything must seem to be conceded by his own free will, nothing wrested from his weakness. He is more covetous of glory than of gain, a commendable quality in a prince, if virtue and truth, not the vanity and soft flattery of courtiers, awarded that glory. He is a great, indeed

the greatest of kings, for he has no superior of whom he may stand in dread, no subject who dares to resist him. His natural ferocity has been subdued by no calamity from without; all who have been involved in any contest with him, have preferred the most precarious treaty to a trial of strength with one so pre-eminent in wealth, in the number of his forces, and the greatness of his puissance.”<sup>g</sup>

A king of this character would eagerly listen to suggestions of interested or flattering courtiers, that unless the Primate’s power were limited, the authority of the king would be reduced to nothing. The succession to the throne would depend entirely on the clergy, and he himself would reign only so long as might seem good to the Archbishop. Nor were they the baser courtiers alone who feared and hated Becket. The nobles might tremble from the example of De Clare, with whose powerful house almost all the Norman baronage was allied, lest every royal grant should be called in question.<sup>h</sup> Even among the clergy Becket had bitter enemies; and though at first they appeared almost as jealous as the Primate for the privileges of their order, the most able soon espoused the cause of the King; those who secretly favoured him were obliged to submit in silence.

The King, determined to bring these great questions to issue, summoned a Parliament at Westminster.

<sup>g</sup> See throughout this epistle of Arnulf of Lisieux, Bouquet, p. 230. This same Arnulf was a crafty and double-dealing prelate. Grim and Roger de Pontigny say that he suggested to Henry the policy of making a party against Becket among the English bishops, while to Becket he plays the part of confidential counsellor.—Grim, p. 29. R. P., p. 119. Will. Canterb., p. 6. Compare on Arnulf, Epist. 346, v. 11, p. 189.

<sup>h</sup> These are the words which Fitz-Stephen places in the mouths of the king’s courtiers.

He commenced the proceedings by enlarging on the abuses of the archidiaconal courts. The arch-deacons kept the most watchful and <sup>Parliament of West</sup> inquisitorial superintendence over the laity, but every offence was easily commuted for a pecuniary fine, which fell to them. The King complained that they levied a revenue from the sins of the people equal to his own, yet that the public morals were only more deeply and irretrievably depraved. He then demanded that all clerks accused of heinous crimes should be immediately degraded and handed over to the officers of his justice, to be dealt with according to law; for their guilt, instead of deserving a lighter punishment, was doubly guilty: he demanded this in the name of equal justice and the peace of the realm. Becket insisted on delay till the next morning, in order that he might consult his suffragan bishops. This the King refused: the bishops withdrew to confer upon their answer. The bishops were disposed to yield, some doubtless impressed with the justice of the demand, some from fear of the King, some from a prudent conviction of the danger of provoking so powerful a monarch, and of involving the Church in a quarrel with Henry at the perilous time of a contest for the Papacy which distracted Europe. Becket inflexibly maintained the inviolability of the holy persons of the clergy.<sup>1</sup> The King then demanded whether they would observe the "customs of the realm." "Saving my order," replied the Archbishop. That order was still to be exempt from all jurisdiction but its own. So answered all the bishops except Hilary of Chichester, who made the declaration without reserve.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Herbert de Bosham, p. 109. Fitz-Stephen, p. 209, *et seq.*

<sup>2</sup> "Dicens se observaturos regias consuetudiner bona fide."

The King hastily broke up the assembly, and left London in a state of consternation, the people and the clergy agitated by conflicting anxieties. He immediately deprived Becket of the custody of the Royal Castles, which he still retained, and of the momentous charge, the education of his son. The bishops entreated Becket either to withdraw or to change the offensive word. At first he declared that if an angel from Heaven should counsel such weakness, he would hold him accursed. At length, however, he yielded, as Herbert de Bosham asserts, out of love for the King,<sup>m</sup> by another account at the persuasion of the Pope's Almoner, said to have been bribed by English gold.<sup>n</sup> He went to Oxford and made the concession.

The King, in order to ratify with the utmost solemnity  
 Jan. 1164. the concession extorted from the bishops, and  
 Council of even from Becket himself, summoned a great  
 Clarendon council of the realm to Clarendon, a royal  
 palace between three and four miles from Salisbury.  
 The two archbishops and eleven bishops, between thirty  
 and forty of the highest nobles, with numbers of inferior  
 barons, were present. It was the King's object to settle  
 beyond dispute the main points in contest between the  
 Crown and the Church; to establish thus, with the con-  
 sent of the whole nation, an English Constitution in  
 Church and State. Becket, it is said, had been assured  
 by some about the King that a mere assent would be  
 demanded to vague and ambiguous, and therefore on  
 occasion disputable, customs. But when these customs,  
 which had been collected and put in writing by the  
 King's order, appeared in the form of precise and bind-  
 ing laws, drawn up with legal technicality by the Chief

<sup>m</sup> Compare W. Canterb. v. f.

<sup>n</sup> Grim, p. 29.

Justiciary, he saw his error, wavered, and endeavoured to recede.<sup>o</sup> The King broke out into one of his ungovernable fits of passion. One or two of the bishops who were out of favour with the King and two knights Templars on their knees implored Becket to abandon his dangerous, fruitless, and ill-timed resistance. The Archbishop took the oath, which had been already sworn to by all the lay barons. He was followed by the rest of the bishops, reluctantly according to one account, and compelled on one side by their dread of the lay barons, on the other by the example and authority of the Primate, according to Becket's biographers, eagerly and of their own accord.<sup>p</sup>

These famous Constitutions were of course feudal in their form and spirit. But they aimed at the <sup>Constitutions of Clarendon.</sup> subjection of all the great prelates of the realm to the Crown to the same extent as the great barons. The new constitution of England made the bishops' fiefs to be granted according to the royal will, and subjected the whole of the clergy equally with the laity to the common laws of the land.<sup>q</sup> I. On the vacancy of every archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory, the revenues came into the King's hands. He was to summon those who had the right of election, which was to take place in the King's Chapel, with his consent, and the counsel of nobles chosen by the King for this office. The prelate elect was immediately to do

<sup>o</sup> Dr. Lingard supposes that Becket demanded that the customs should be reduced to writing. This seems quite contrary to his policy; and Edward Grim writes thus: "Nam domestici regis, dato consentiente consilio, securum fecerant archeepiscopum, quod nunquam scriborentur leges, nunquam

illarum fieret recordatio, si eum verbo tantum in audientia procerum honorasset," &c.—P. 31.

<sup>p</sup> See the letter of Gilbert Foliot, of which I do not doubt the authenticity.

<sup>q</sup> According to the Cottonian copy published by Lord Lyttelton, Constitutions xii. xv. iv.

homage to the King as his liege lord, for life, limb, and worldly honours, excepting his order. The archbishops, bishops, and all beneficiaries, held their estates on the tenure of baronies, amenable to the King's justice, and bound to sit with the other barons in all pleas of the Crown, except in capital cases. No archbishop, bishop, or any other person could quit the realm without royal permission, or without taking an oath at the King's requisition, not to do any damage either going, staying, or returning, to the King or the kingdom.

II. All clerks accused of any crime were to be summoned before the King's Courts. The King's justiciaries were to decide whether it was a case for civil or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Those which belonged to the latter were to be removed to the Bishops' Court. If the clerk was found guilty or confessed his guilt, the Church could protect him no longer.<sup>r</sup>

III. All disputes concerning advowsons and presentations to benefices were to be decided in the King's Courts; and the King's consent was necessary for the appointment to any benefice within the King's domain.<sup>s</sup>

IV. No tenant in chief of the King, none of the officers of the King's household, could be excommunicated, nor his lands placed under interdict, until due information had been laid before the King; or, in his absence from the realm, before the great Justiciary, in order that he might determine in each case the respective rights of the civil and ecclesiastical courts.<sup>t</sup>

V. Appeals lay from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the Archbishop. On failure of justice by the Archbishop, in the last resort to the King, who

<sup>r</sup> Constitution iii.

<sup>s</sup> Constitutions i. and ii.

<sup>t</sup> Constitution vii., somewhat limited and explained by x.

was to take care that justice was done in the Archbishop's Court; and no further appeal was to be made without the King's consent. This was manifestly and avowedly intended to limit appeals to Rome.

All these statutes, in number sixteen, were restrictions on the distinctive immunities of the clergy: one, and that unnoticed, was really an invasion of popular freedom; no son of a villein could be ordained without the consent of his lord.

Some of these customs were of doubtful authenticity. On the main question, the exorbitant powers of the ecclesiastical courts and the immunity of the clergy from all other jurisdiction, there was an unrepealed statute of William the Conqueror. Before the Conquest the bishop sat with the alderman in the same court. The statute of William created a separate jurisdiction of great extent in the spiritual court. This was not done to aggrandise the Church, of which in some respects the Conqueror was jealous, but to elevate the importance of the great Norman prelates whom he had thrust into the English sees. It raised another class of powerful feudatories to support the foreign throne, bound to it by common interest as well as by the attachment of race. But at this time neither party took any notice of the ancient statute. The King's advisers of course avoided the dangerous question; Becket and the Churchmen (Becket himself declared that he was unlearned in the customs), standing on the divine and indefeasible right of the clergy, could hardly rest on a recent statute granted by the royal will, and therefore liable to be annulled by the same authority. The Customs, they averred, were of themselves illegal, as clashing with higher irrepealable laws.

To these Customs Becket had now sworn without

reserve. Three copies were ordered to be made—one for the Archbishop of Canterbury, one for York, one to be laid up in the royal archives. To these the King demanded the further guarantee of the seals of the different parties. The Primate, whether already repenting of his assent, or under the vague impression that this was committing himself still further (for oaths might be absolved, seals could not be torn from public documents), now obstinately refused to make any further concession. The refusal threw suspicion on the sincerity of his former act. The King, the other prelates, the nobles, all but Becket,<sup>u</sup> subscribed and sealed the Constitutions of Clarendon as the laws of England.

As the Primate rode from Winchester in profound silence, meditating on the acts of the council and on his own conduct, one of his attendants, who has himself related the conversation, endeavoured to raise his spirits. "It is a fit punishment," said Becket, "for one who, not trained in the school of the Saviour, but in the King's court, a man of pride and vanity, from a follower of hawks and hounds, a patron of players, has dared to assume the care of so many souls."<sup>x</sup> De Bosham significantly reminded his master of St. Peter, his denial of the Lord, his subsequent repentance. On his return to Canterbury Becket imposed upon himself the severest mortification, and suspended himself from his function

<sup>April 1.</sup> of offering the sacrifice on the altar. He wrote almost immediately to the Pope to seek counsel and absolution from his oath. He received both. The absolution restored all his vivacity.

---

<sup>u</sup> Herbert de Bosham. "Caute avium factus sum pastor ovium; dudum quidem non de plano negat, sed dif- fidenter dicebat adhuc."

<sup>x</sup> "Superbus et vanus, de pastore

p. 126.

fautor histriorum et eorum sectator tot uniarum pastor." — De Bosham,

But the King had likewise his emissaries with the Pope at Sens. He endeavoured to obtain a legatine commission over the whole realm of England for Becket's enemy, Roger Archbishop of York, and a recommendation from the Pope to Becket to observe the "customs" of the realm. Two embassies were sent by the King for this end: first the Bishops of Lisieux and Poitiers; then Geoffrey Ridel, Archdeacon of Canterbury (who afterwards appears so hostile to the Primate as to be called by him that archdevil, not arch-deacon), and the subtle John of Oxford. The embarrassed Pope (throughout it must be remembered that there was a formidable Antipope), afraid at once of estranging Henry, and unwilling to abandon Becket, granted the legation to the Archbishop of York. To the Primate's great indignation, Roger had his cross borne before him in the province of Canterbury. On Becket's angry remonstrance, the Pope, while on the one hand he enjoined on Becket the greatest caution and forbearance in the inevitable contest, assured him that he would never permit the see of Canterbury to be subject to any authority but his own.<sup>y</sup>

<sup>y</sup> Read the Epistles, apud Giles, v. iv., 1, 3, Bouquet, xvi. 210, to judge of the skilful steering and difficulties of the Pope. There is a very curious letter of an emissary of Becket, describing the death of the Anti-Pope (he died at Lucca, April 21). The canons of San Frediano, in Lucca, refused to bury him, because he was already "buried in hell." The writer announces that the Emperor also was ill, that the Empress had miscarried, and that therefore all France adhered with greater devotion to Alexander;

and the Legatine commission to the Archbishop of York had expired without hope of recovery. The writer ventures, however, to suggest to Becket to conduct himself with modesty; to seek rather than avoid intercourse with the king.—Apud Giles, iv. 240; Bouquet, p. 210. See also the letter of John, Bishop of Poitiers, who says of the Pope, "Gravi redimit poenitentia, illam qualis quam Eboracensi fecerit, concessionem."—Bouquet, p. 214.

Becket secretly went down to his estate at Romney, near the sea-coast, in the hope of crossing the Straits, and so finding refuge and maintaining his cause by his personal presence with the Pope. Stormy weather forced him to abandon his design. He then betook himself to the King at Woodstock. He was coldly received. The King at first dissembled his knowledge of the Primate's attempt to cross the sea, a direct violation of one of the Constitutions; but on his departure he asked with bitter jocularity whether Becket had sought to leave the realm because England could not contain himself and the King.<sup>2</sup>

The tergiversation of Becket, and his attempt thus to violate one of the Constitutions of Clarendon, to which he had sworn, showed that he was not to be bound by oaths. No treaty could be made where one party claimed the power of retracting, and might at any time be released from his covenant. In the mind of Henry, whose will had never yet met resistance, the determination was confirmed, if he could not subdue the Prelate, to crush the refractory subject. Becket's enemies possessed the King's ear. Some of those enemies no doubt hated him for his former favour with the King, some dreaded lest the severity of so inflexible a prelate should curb their licence, some held property belonging to or claimed by the Church, some to flatter the King, some in honest indignation at the duplicity of Becket and in love of peace, but all concurred to inflame the resentment of Henry, and to attribute to Becket words and designs insulting to the King and disparaging to the royal authority. Becket, holding such notions as he did

<sup>2</sup> I follow De Bosham. Fitz-Stephen says that he was repelled from the gates of the king's palace at Woodstock; and that he afterwards went to Romney to attempt to cross the sea.

of Church power, would not be cautious in asserting it; and whatever he might utter in his pride would be embittered rather than softened when repeated to the King.

Since the Council of Clarendon Becket stood alone. All the higher clergy, the great prelates of the kingdom, were now either his open adversaries or were compelled to dissemble their favour towards him. Whether alienated, as some declared, by his pusillanimity at Clarendon, bribed by the gifts, or overawed by the power of the King, whether conscientiously convinced that in such times of schism and division it might be fatal to the interests of the Church to advance her loftiest pretensions, all, especially the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Salisbury, and Chichester, were arrayed on the King's side. Becket himself attributed the chief guilt of his persecution to the bishops. "The King would have been quiet if they had not been so tamely subservient to his wishes."<sup>a</sup>

Before the close of the year Becket was cited to appear before a great council of the realm at Northampton. All England crowded to witness this final strife, it might be, between the royal and the ecclesiastical power. The Primate entered Northampton with only his own retinue; the King had passed the afternoon amusing himself with hawking in the pleasant meadows around. The Archbishop, on the following morning after mass, appeared in the King's chamber with a cheerful countenance. The King gave not, according to English custom, the kiss of peace.

The citation of the Primate before the King in council

<sup>a</sup> "Quievisset ille, si non acquevissent illi."—Becket, Epist. ii. p. 5.  
Compare the whole letter.

at Northampton was to answer a charge of withholding justice from John the Marshall employed in the king's exchequer, who claimed the estate of Pagaham from the see of Canterbury. Twice had Becket been summoned to appear in the King's court to answer for this denial of justice: once he had refused to appear, the second time he did not appear in person. Becket in vain alleged an informality in the original proceedings of John the Marshall.<sup>b</sup> The court, the bishops, as well as the barons, declared him guilty of contumacy; all his goods and chattels became, according to the legal phrase, at the King's mercy.<sup>c</sup> The fine was assessed at 500 pounds. Becket submitted, not without irony: "This, then, is one of the new customs of Clarendon." But he protested against the unheard-of audacity that the bishops should presume to sit in judgement on their spiritual parent; it was a greater crime than to uncover their father's nakedness.<sup>d</sup> Sarcasms and protests passed alike without notice. But the bishops, all except Foliot,

Demands on Becket consented to become sureties for this exorbitant fine. Demands rising one above another seemed framed for the purpose of reducing the Archbishop to the humiliating condition of a debtor to the King, entirely at his disposal. First 300 pounds were demanded as due from the castles of Eye and Berkhamstead. Becket pleaded that he had expended a much larger sum on the repairs of the castles: he found sureties likewise for this payment, the Earl of Glou-

<sup>b</sup> He had been sworn not on the Gospels, but on a tropologium, a book of church music.

according to those of London.—Fitz-Stephen.

<sup>c</sup> Goods and chattels at the king's mercy were redeemable at a customary fine; this fine, according to the customs of Kent, would have been larger than

<sup>d</sup> "Minus fore malum verenda patris detecta deridere, quam patris ipsius personam judicare."—De Boshan, p. 135.

cester, William of Eynsford, and another of "his men." The next day the demand was for 500 pounds lent by the King during the siege of Toulouse. Becket declared that this was a gift, not a loan; <sup>e</sup> but the King denying the plea, judgement was again entered against Becket. At last came the overwhelming charge, an account of all the monies received during his chancellorship from the vacant archbishopric and from other bishoprics and abbeys. The debt was calculated at the enormous sum of 44,000 marks. Becket was astounded at this unexpected claim. As chancellor, in all likelihood, he had kept no very strict account of what was expended in his own and in the royal service; and the King seemed blind to this abuse of the royal right, by which so large a sum had accumulated by keeping open those benefices which ought to have been instantly filled. Becket, recovered from his first amazement, replied that he had not been cited to answer on such a charge; at another time he should be prepared to answer all just demands of the Crown. He now requested delay, in order to advise with his suffragans and the clergy. He withdrew, but from that time no single baron visited the object of the royal disfavour. Becket assembled all the poor, even the beggars, who could be found, to fill his vacant board.

In his extreme exigency the Primate consulted separately first the bishops, then the abbots. Their advice was different according to their characters and their sentiments towards him. He had what might seem an unanswerable plea, a formal acquittance from the chief Justiciary De Luci, the King's repre-

<sup>e</sup> Fitz-Stephen states this demand at 500 marks, and a second 500 for which a bond had been given to a Jew.

sentative, for all obligations incurred in his civil capacity before his consecration as archbishop.<sup>f</sup> The King, however, it was known, declared that he had given no such authority. Becket had the further excuse that all which he now possessed was the property of the Church, and could not be made liable for responsibilities incurred in a secular capacity. The bishops, however, were either convinced of the insufficiency or the inadmissibility of that plea. Henry of Winchester recommended an endeavour to purchase the King's pardon ; he offered 2000 marks as his contribution. Others urged Becket to stand on his dignity, to defy the worst, under the shelter of his priesthood ; no one would venture to lay hands on a holy prelate. Foliot and his party betrayed their object.<sup>g</sup> They exhorted him as the only way of averting the implacable wrath of the King at once to resign his see. "Would," said Hilary of Chichester, "you were no longer archbishop, but plain Thomas. Thou knowest the King better than we do ; he has declared that thou and he cannot remain together in England, he as King, thou as Primate. Who will be bound for such an amount ? Throw thyself on the King's mercy, or to the eternal disgrace of the Church thou wilt be arrested and imprisoned as a debtor to the Crown." The next day was Sunday ; the Archbishop did not leave his lodgings.

<sup>f</sup> Neither party denied this acquittance given in the King's name by the Justiciary Richard de Laci. This, it should seem, unusual precaution, or at least this precaution taken with such unusual care, seems to imply some suspicion that, without it, the archbishop was liable to be called to account ; an account which probably, from the splendid prodigality with which Becket had lavished the King's

money and his own, it might be difficult or inconvenient to produce.

<sup>g</sup> In an account of this affair, written later, Becket accuses Foliot of aspiring to the primacy—"et qui adspirabant ad fastigium ecclesiae Cantuarensis, ut vulgo dicitur et creditur, in nostram perniciem, utinam minus ambitiosè, quam avidè." This could be none but Foliot.—Epist. lxxv. p. 154.

On Monday the agitation of his spirits had brought on an attack of a disorder to which he was subject: he was permitted to repose. On the morrow he had determined on his conduct. At one time he had seriously meditated on a more humiliating course: he proposed to seek the royal presence barefooted with the cross in his hands, to throw himself at the King's feet, appealing to his old affection, and imploring him to restore peace to the Church. What had been the effect of such a step on the violent but not ungenerous heart of Henry? But Becket yielded to haughtier counsels more congenial to his own intrepid character. He began by the significant act of celebrating, out of its due order, the service of St. Stephen, the first martyr. It contained passages of holy writ (as no doubt Henry was instantly informed) concerning "kings taking counsel against the godly." The mass concluded; in all the majesty of his holy character, in his full pontifical habits, himself bearing the archiepiscopal cross, the primate rode to the King's residence, and dismounting entered the royal hall. The cross seemed, as it were, an up-  
Becket in the  
King's hall.

lifting of the banner of the Church, in defiance of that of the King, in the royal presence; or it might be in that awful imitation of the Saviour, at which no scruple was ever made by the bolder churchmen—it was the servant of Christ who himself bore his own cross.<sup>h</sup> "What means this new fashion of the Archbishop bearing his own cross?" said the Archdeacon of Lisieux. "A fool," said Foliot, "he always was and

<sup>h</sup> "Tanquam in prolio Domini, signifer Domini, vexillum Domini erigen: illud etiam Domini non solum spiritualiter, sed et figuraliter implens. Si quis,' inquit, 'vult meus esse disci-

pulus, abneget semet ipsum, tollat crucem suam et sequatur me." De Bosham, p. 143. Compare the letter of the Bishops to the Pope.—Giles: v. 256; Bouquet, 224.

always will be." They made room for him; he took his accustomed seat in the centre of the bishops. Foliot endeavoured to persuade him to lay down the cross. "If the sword of the king and the cross of the archbishop were to come into conflict, which were the more fearful weapon?" Becket held the cross firmly, which Foliot and the Bishop of Hereford strove, but in vain, to wrest from his grasp.

The bishops were summoned into the King's presence: Becket sat alone in the outer hall. The Archbishop of York, who, as Becket's partisans asserted, designedly came later that he might appear to be of the King's intimate council, swept through the hall with his cross borne before him. Like hostile spears cross confronted cross.<sup>i</sup>

During this interval De Bosham, the archbishop's reader, who had reminded his master that he had been standard-bearer of the King of England, and was now the standard-bearer of the King of the Angels, put this question, "If they should lay their impious hand upon thee, art thou prepared to fulminate excommunication against them?" Fitz-Stephen, who sat at his feet, said in a loud clear voice, "That be far from thee; so did not the Apostles and Martyrs of God: they prayed for their persecutors and forgave them." Some of his more attached followers burst into tears. "A little later," says the faithful Fitz-Stephen of himself, "when one of the King's ushers would not allow me to speak to the Archbishop, I made a sign to him and drew his attention to the Saviour on the cross."

The bishops admitted to the King's presence an-

---

<sup>i</sup> "Quasi pila minantia pilis," quotes Fitz-Stephen; "Memento," said De Bosham, "quondam te extitisse regis Anglorum signiferum inexpugnabilem, nunc vero ai signifer regis Angelorum expugnari turpissimum."—p. 146.

nounced the appeal of the Archbishop to the Pope, and his inhibition to his suffragans to sit in judgement in a secular council on their metropolitan.<sup>k</sup> These were again direct infringements on two of the Constitutions of Clarendon, sworn to by Becket in an oath still held valid by the King and his barons. The King appealed to the council. Some seized the occasion of boldly declaring to the King that he had brought this difficulty on himself by advancing a low-born man to such favour and dignity. All agreed that Becket was guilty <sup>Condemna-</sup>  
<sup>tion of</sup>  
<sup>Becket.</sup> of perjury and treason.<sup>m</sup> A kind of low acclama-

mation followed which was heard in the outer room and made Becket's followers tremble. The King sent certain counts and barons to demand of Becket whether he, a liegeman of the King, and sworn to observe the Constitutions of Clarendon, had lodged this appeal and pronounced this inhibition? The Archbishop replied with quiet intrepidity. In his long speech he did not hesitate for a word: he pleaded that he had not been cited to answer these charges; he alleged again the Justiciary's acquittance; he ended by solemnly renewing his inhibition and his appeal: "My person and my church I place under the protection of the sovereign Pontiff."

The barons of Normandy and England heard with wonder this defiance of the King. Some seemed awestruck and were mute; the more fierce and lawless could not restrain their indignation. "The Conqueror knew best how to deal with these turbulent churchmen.

<sup>k</sup> "Dicebant enim episcopi, quod adhuc, ipsa die, intra decem dies date sententiae, eos ad dominum Papam appellaverat, et ne de cetero eum judicarent pro seculari querelâ, quae de tempore ante archipræsulatum ei moveretur, auctoritate domini Papæ prohibuit."—Fitz-Stephen, p. 230.

<sup>m</sup> Herbert de Bosham, f. 146.

He seized his own brother, Odo Bishop of Bayeux, and chastised him for his rebellion; he threw Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, into a foetid dungeon. The Count of Anjou, the King's father, treated still worse the bishop elect of Seez and many of his clergy: he ordered them to be shamefully mutilated and derided their sufferings."

The King summoned the bishops, on their allegiance as barons, to join in the sentence against Becket. But the inhibition of their metropolitan had thrown them into embarrassment, and perhaps they felt that the offence of Becket, if not capital treason, bordered upon it. It might be a sentence of blood, in which no churchman might concur by his suffrage—they dreaded the breach of canonical obedience. They entered the hall where Becket sat alone. The gentler prelates, Robert of Lincoln and others, were moved to tears; even Henry of Winchester advised the archbishop to make an unconditional surrender of his see. The more vehement Hilary of Chichester addressed him thus: "Lord Primate, we have just cause of complaint against you. Your inhibition has placed us between the hammer and the anvil: if we disobey it, we violate our canonical obedience; if we obey, we infringe the constitutions of the realm and offend the King's majesty. Yourself were the first to subscribe the customs at Clarendon, you now compel us to break them. We appeal, by the King's grace, to our lord the Pope." Becket answered "I hear."

They returned to the King, and with difficulty obtained an exemption from concurrence in the sentence: they promised to join in a supplication to the Pope to depose Becket. The King permitted their appeal. Robert Earl of Leicester, a grave and aged

nobleman, was commissioned to pronounce the sentence. Leicester had hardly begun when Becket sternly interrupted him. “Thy sentence! son and Earl, hear me first! The King was pleased to promote me against my will to the archbishopric of Canterbury. I was then declared free from all secular obligations. Ye are my children; presume ye against law and reason to sit in judgement on your spiritual father? I am to be judged only, under God, by the Pope. To him I appeal, before him I cite you, barons and my suffragans, to appear. Under the protection of the Catholic Church and the Apostolic See I depart!”<sup>n</sup> He rose and walked slowly down the hall. A deep murmur ran through the crowd. Some took up straws and threw them at him. One uttered the word “Traitor!” The old chivalrous spirit woke in the soul of Becket. “Were it not for my order, you should rue that word.” But by other accounts he restrained not his language to this pardonable impropriety—he met scorn with scorn. One officer of the King’s household he upbraided for having had a kinsman hanged. Anselm, the King’s brother, he called “bastard and catamite.” The door was locked, but fortunately the key was found. He passed out into the street, where he was received by the populace, to whom he had endeared himself by his charities, his austerities, perhaps by his courageous opposition to the king and the nobles, amid loud acclamations. They pressed so closely around him for his blessing that he could scarcely guide his horse. He returned to the church of St. Andrew, placed his cross by the altar of the Virgin. “This was a fearful day,” said Fitz-Stephen. “The

<sup>n</sup> De Bosham’s account is, that notwithstanding the first interruption, Leicester reluctantly proceeded till he came to the word “perjurrd,” on which Becket rose and spoke.

day of judgement," he replied, "will be more fearful." After supper he sent the Bishops of Hereford, Worcester, and Rochester to the King to request permission to leave the kingdom: the King coldly deferred his answer till the morrow.

Becket and his friends no doubt thought his life in danger: he is said to have received some alarming warnings.<sup>o</sup> It is reported, on the other hand, that the King, apprehensive of the fierce zeal of his followers, issued a proclamation that no one should do harm to the archbishop or his people. It is more likely that the King, who must have known the peril of attempting the life of an archbishop, would have apprehended and committed him to prison. Becket expressed his intention to pass the night in the church: his bed was strewn

<sup>Flight of  
Becket,  
Oct. 13.</sup> before the altar. At midnight he rose, and with only two monks and a servant stole out of the northern gate, the only one which was not guarded. He carried with him only his archiepiscopal pall and his seal. The weather was wet and stormy, but the next morning they reached Lincoln, and lodged with a pious citizen—piety and admiration of Becket were the same thing. At Lincoln he took the disguise of a monk, dropped down the Witham to a hermitage in the fens belonging to the Cistercians of Sempringham; thence by cross-roads, and chiefly by night, he found his way to Estrey, about five miles from Deal, a manor belonging to Christ Church in Canterbury. He remained there a week. On All Souls Day he went on board a boat, just before morning, and by the evening reached the coast of Flanders. To avoid observation he landed on the open shore near Gravelines. His

large, loose shoes made it difficult to wade through the sand without falling. He sat down in despair. After some delay, was obtained for a prelate, accustomed to the prancing war-horse or stately cavalcade, a sorry nag without a saddle, and with a wisp of hay for a bridle. But he soon got weary and was fain to walk. He had many adventures by the way. He was once nearly betrayed by gazing with delight on a falcon upon a young squire's wrist ; his fright punished him for this relapse into his secular vanities. The host of a small inn recognised him by his lofty look and the whiteness of his hands. At length he arrived at the monastery of Clair Marais, near St. Omer : he was there joined by Herbert de Bosham, who had been left behind to collect what money he could at Canterbury : he brought but 100 marks and some plate. While he was in this part of Flanders the Justiciary, Richard de Luci, passed through the town on his way to England. He tried in vain to persuade the archbishop to return with him : Becket suspected his friendly overtures, or had resolutely determined not to put himself again in the King's power.

In the first access of indignation at Becket's flight the King had sent orders for strict watch to be kept in the ports of the kingdom, especially Dover. The next measure was to pre-occupy the minds of the Count of Flanders, the King of France, and the Pope against his fugitive subject. Henry could not but foresee how formidable an ally the exile might become to his rivals and enemies, how dangerous to his extensive but ill-consolidated foreign dominions. He might know that Becket would act and be received as an independent potentate. The rank of his ambassadors implied the importance of their mission to France. They were the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Exeter,

Chichester, and Worcester, the Earl of Arundel, and three other distinguished nobles. The same day that Becket passed to Gravelines, they crossed from Dover to Calais.<sup>p</sup>

The Earl of Flanders, though with some cause of hostility to Becket, had offered him a refuge; <sup>Becket in exile.</sup> yet perhaps was not distinctly informed or would not know that the exile was in his dominions.<sup>q</sup> He received the King's envoys with civility. The King of France was at Compiègne. The strongest passions in the feeble mind of Louis VII. were jealousy of Henry of England, and a servile bigotry to the Church, to which he seemed determined to compensate for the hostility and disobedience of his youth. Against Henry, personally, there were old causes of hatred rankling in his heart, not the less deep because they could not be avowed. Henry of England was now the husband of Eleanor, who, after some years of marriage, had contemptuously divorced the King of France as a monk <sup>From 1152 to 1164.</sup> rather than a husband, had thrown herself into the arms of Henry and carried with her a dowry as large as half the kingdom of France. There had since been years either of fierce war, treacherous negotiations, or jealous and armed peace, between the rival sovereigns.

<sup>p</sup> Foliot and the King's envoys crossed the same day. It is rather amusing that, though Becket crossed the same day in an open boat, and, as is incautiously betrayed by his friends, suffered much from the rough sea, the weather is described as in his case almost miraculously favourable, in the other as miraculously tempestuous. So that while Becket calmly glided over,

Foliot in despair of his life threw off his cowl and cope.

<sup>q</sup> Compare, however, Roger of Pontigny. By his account, the Count of Flanders, a relative and partisan of Henry ("consanguineus et qui partes ejus lovebat"), would have arrested him. He escaped over the border by a trick.—Roger de Pontigny, p. 143.

Louis had watched, and received regular accounts of the proceedings in England ; his admiration of Becket for his lofty churchmanship and daring opposition to Henry was at its height, scarcely disguised. He had already in secret offered to receive Becket, not as a fugitive, but as the sharer in his kingdom. The ambassadors appeared before Louis and presented a letter urging the King of France not to admit within his dominions the traitor Thomas, late Archbishop of Canterbury. “Late Archbishop ! and who has presumed to depose him ? I am a king, like my brother of <sup>Louis of France.</sup> England ; I should not dare to depose the meanest of my clergy. Is this the King’s gratitude for the services of his Chancellor, to banish him from France, as he has done from England ? ”<sup>x</sup> Louis wrote a strong letter to the Pope, recommending to his favour the cause of Becket as his own.

The ambassadors passed onward to Sens, where resided the Pope Alexander III., himself an exile, and opposing his spiritual power to the highest temporal authority, that of the Emperor and his subservient Antipope. Alexander was in a position of extraordinary difficulty : on the one side were gratitude to King Henry for his firm support, and the fear of estranging so powerful a sovereign, on whose unrivalled wealth he reckoned as the main strength of his cause ; on the other, the dread of offending the King of France, also his faithful partisan, in whose dominions he was a refugee, and the duty, the interest, the strong inclination to maintain every privilege of the hierarchy. To Henry Alexander almost owed his pontificate. His first and most faithful adherents had been Theobald the primate,

<sup>x</sup> Giles, iv. 253 ; Bouquet, p. 217.

the English Church, and Henry King of England; and when the weak Louis had entered into dangerous negotiations at Lannes with the Emperor; when at Dijon he had almost placed himself in the power of Frederick, and his voluntary or enforced defection had filled Alexander with dread, the advance of Henry of England with a powerful force to the neighbourhood rescued the French king from his perilous position.\* And now, though Victor the Antipope was dead, a successor, Guido of Crema, had been set up by the imperial party, and Frederick would lose no opportunity of gaining, if any serious quarrel should alienate him from Alexander, a monarch of such surpassing power. An envoy from England, John Cummin, was even now at the imperial court.<sup>t</sup>

Becket's messengers, before the reception of Henry's ambassadors by Pope Alexander, had been admitted to a private interview. The account of Becket's "fight with beasts" at Northampton, and a skilful parallel with St. Paul, had melted the heart of the Pontiff, as he no doubt thought himself suffering like persecutions, to a flood of tears. How in truth could a Pope venture to abandon such a champion of what were called the liberties of the church? He had, in fact, throughout been in secret correspondence with Becket. Whenever letters could escape the jealous watchfulness of the King, they had passed between England and Sens.<sup>u</sup>

\* See back, page 9.

<sup>t</sup> Epist. Nuntii; Giles, iv. 254: Bouquet, p. 217.

<sup>u</sup> Becket writes from England to the Pope, "Quod petimus, summo silentio petimus occultari. Nihil enim nobis tutum est, quum omnia ferè referuntur ad regem, quae nobis in conclavi vel in aurem dicuntur." There is a significant clause at the end of this

letter, which implies that the emissaries of the Church did not confine themselves to Church affairs: "De Wallensibus et Oweno, qui se principem nominat, *providatis*, quia Dominus Rex super hoc maximè motus est et indignatus." The Welsh were in arms against the King. This borders on high treason.—Apud Giles, iii. 1, Bouquet, 221.

The ambassadors of Henry were received in state in the open consistory. Foliot of London began with his usual ability; his warmth at length betrayed him into the Scriptural citation,—“The wicked fleeth when no man pursueth.” “Forbear,” said the Pope. “I will forbear him,” answered Foliot. “It is for thine own sake, not for his, that I bid thee forbear.” The Pope’s severe manner silenced the Bishop of London. Hilary, Bishop of Chichester, who had overweening confidence in his own eloquence, began a long harangue; but at a fatal blunder in his Latin, the whole Italian court burst into laughter.\* The discomfited orator tried in vain to proceed. The Archbishop of York spoke with prudent brevity. The Count of Arundel, more cautious or less learned, used his native Norman. His speech was mild, grave, and conciliatory, and therefore the most embarrassing to the Pontiff. Alexander consented to send his cardinal legates to England; but neither the arguments of Foliot, nor those of Arundel, who now rose to something like a menace of recourse to the Antipope, would induce him to invest them with full power. The Pope would entrust to none but to himself the prerogative of final judgement. Alexander mistrusted the venality of his cardinals, and Henry’s subsequent dealing with some of them justified his mistrust.<sup>y</sup> He was himself inflexible to tempting offers. The envoys privately proposed to extend the payment of Peter’s Pence to almost all classes, and to secure the tax in perpetuity to the see of Rome. The ambassadors retreated in haste; their commission had been limited

\* The word “oportuebat” was too bad for monkish, or rather for Roman, ears.

there were some of them “qui acceptā a rege pecunia partes ejus fovebant,” particularly William of Pavia.—

<sup>y</sup> According to Roger of Pontigny, p. 153.

to a few days. The bishops, so strong was the popular feeling in France for Becket, had entered Sens as retainers of the Earl of Arundel: they received intimation that certain lawless knights in the neighbourhood had determined to waylay and plunder these enemies of the Church, and of the saintly Becket.

Far different was the progress of the exiled primate. From St. Bertin he was escorted by the abbot, and by the Bishop of Terouenne. He entered France; he was met, as he approached Soissons, by the King's brothers, the Archbishop of Rheims, and a long train of bishops, abbots, and dignitaries of the church; he entered

<sup>Becket  
at Sens.</sup> Soissons at the head of 300 horsemen. The interview of Louis with Becket raised his admiration into passion. As the envoys of Henry passed on one side of the river, they saw the pomp in which the ally of the King of France, rather than the exile from England, was approaching Sens. The cardinals, whether from prudence, jealousy, or other motives, were cool in their reception of Becket. The Pope at once granted the honour of a public audience; he placed Becket on his right hand, and would not allow him to rise to speak. Becket, after a skilful account of his hard usage, spread out the parchment which contained the Constitutions of Clarendon. They were read; the whole Consistory exclaimed against the violation of ecclesiastical privileges. On further examination the Pope acknowledged that six of them were less evil than the rest; on the remaining ten he pronounced his unqualified condemnation. He rebuked the weakness of Becket in swearing to these articles, it is said, with the severity of a father, the tenderness of a mother.<sup>2</sup> He consoled him with the

assurance that he had atoned by his sufferings and his patience for his brief infirmity. Becket pursued his advantage. The next day, by what might seem to some trustful magnanimity, to others a skilful mode of getting rid of certain objections which had been raised concerning his election, he tendered the resignation of his archiepiscopate to the Pope. Some of the more politic, it was said, more venal cardinals, entreated the Pontiff to put an end at once to this dangerous quarrel by accepting the surrender.<sup>a</sup> But the Pontiff (his own judgement being supported among others by the Cardinal Hyacinth) restored to him the archiepiscopal ring, thus ratifying his primacy. He assured Becket of his protection, and committed him to the hospitable care of the Abbot of Pontigny, a monastery about twelve leagues from Sens. “So long have you lived in ease and opulence, now learn the lessons of poverty from the poor.”<sup>b</sup> Yet Alexander thought it prudent to inhibit any proceedings of Becket against the King till the following Easter.

Becket’s emissaries had been present during the interview of Henry’s ambassadors with the Pope. Henry, no doubt, received speedy intelligence of these proceedings with Becket. He was at Marlborough after a disastrous campaign in Wales.<sup>c</sup> He issued immediate orders to

\* Alani Vita (p. 362); and Alan’s Life rests mainly on the authority of John of Salisbury. Herbert de Bosham suppresses this.

<sup>b</sup> The Abbot of Pontigny was an ardent admirer of Becket. See letter of the Bishop of Poitiers, Bouquet, p. 214. Prayers were offered up throughout the struggle with Henry for Becket’s success at Pontigny,

Citeaux, and Clairvaux.—Giles, iv. 255.

<sup>c</sup> Compare Lingard. Becket on this news exclaimed, as is said, “His wise men are become fools; the Lord hath sent among them a spirit of giddiness; they have made England to reel to and fro like a drunken man.”—Vol. iii. p. 227. No doubt, he would have it supposed God’s vengeance for his own wrongs.

seize the revenues of the Archbishop, and promulgated  
 Effect on King Henry. a mandate to the bishops to sequester the estates  
 of all the clergy who had followed him to France. He forbade public prayers for the Primate. In  
 Wrath of Henry. the exasperated state, especially of the monkish mind, prayers for Becket would easily slide into anathemas against the King. The payment of Peter's Pence<sup>a</sup> to the Pope was suspended. All correspondence with Becket was forbidden. But the resentment of Henry was not satisfied. He passed a sentence of banishment, and ordered at once to be driven from the kingdom all the primate's kinsmen, dependents, and friends. Four hundred persons, it is said, of both sexes, of every age, even infants at the breast were included (and it was the depth of winter) in this relentless edict. Every adult was to take an oath to proceed immediately to Becket, in order that his eyes might be shocked, and his heart wrung by the miseries which he had brought on his family and his friends. This order was as inhumanly executed, as inhumanly enacted.<sup>b</sup> It was intrusted to Randolph de Broc, a fierce soldier, the bitterest of Becket's personal enemies. It was as impolitic as cruel. The monasteries and convents of Flanders and of France were thrown open to the exiles with generous hospitality. Throughout both these countries was spread a multitude of persons appealing to the pity, to the indignation of all orders of the people,

<sup>a</sup>. There are in Foliot's letters many curious circumstances about the collection and transmission of Peter's Pence. In Alexander's present state, notwithstanding the amity of the King of France, this source of revenue was no doubt important.—Epist. 149, 172, &c. Alexander wrote from Clermont

to Foliot (June 8, 1165) to collect the tax, to do all in his power for the recal of Becket : to Henry, reprobating the Constitutions ; to Becket, urging prudence and circumspection. This was later. The Pope was then on his way to Italy, where he might need Henry's gold.      <sup>b</sup> Becket, Epist. 4, p. 7.

and so deepening the universal hatred of Henry. The enemy of the Church was self-convicted of equal enmity to all Christianity of heart.

In his seclusion at Pontigny Becket seemed determined to compensate by the sternest monastic discipline for that deficiency which had been alleged <sup>Becket at Pontigny.</sup> on his election to the archbishopric. He put on the coarse Cistercian dress. He lived on the hard and scanty Cistercian diet. Outwardly he still maintained something of his old magnificence and the splendour of his station. His establishment of horses and retainers was so costly, that his sober friend, John of Salisbury, remonstrated against the profuse expenditure. Richer viands were indeed served on a table apart, ostensibly for Becket; but while he himself was content with the pulse and gruel of the monks, those meats and game were given away to the beggars. His devotions were long and secret, broken with perpetual groans. At night he rose from the bed strewn with rich coverings, as beseeming an archbishop, and summoned his chaplain to the work of flagellation. Not satisfied with this, he tore his flesh with his nails, and lay on the cold floor, with a stone for his pillow. His health suffered; wild dreams, so reports one of his attendants, haunted his broken slumbers, of cardinals plucking out his eyes, fierce assassins cleaving his tonsured crown.<sup>f</sup> His studies were neither suited to calm his mind, nor to abase his hierarchical haughtiness. He devoted his time to the canon law, of which the False Decretals now formed an integral part: sacerdotal fraud justifying the loftiest sacerdotal presumption. John of Salisbury again interposed with friendly remonstrance. He urged him

---

<sup>f</sup> Edw. Grim.

to withdraw from these undevotional inquiries ; he recommended to him the works of a Pope of a different character, the *Morals* of Gregory the Great. He exhorted Becket to confer with holy men on books of spiritual improvement.

King Henry in the mean time took a loftier and more <sup>Negotiations with the Emperor.</sup> menacing tone towards the Pope. "It is an unheard of thing that the court of Rome should support traitors against my sovereign authority ; I have not deserved such treatment.<sup>s</sup> I am still more indignant that the justice is denied to me which is granted to the meanest clerk." In his wrath he made overtures to Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, the maker, he might be called, of two Antipopes, and the minister of the Emperor, declaring that he had long sought an opportunity of falling off from Alexander and his perfidious cardinals, who presumed to support against him the traitor Thomas, late Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Emperor met the advances of Henry with promptitude, which showed the importance he attached to the alliance. Reginald of Cologne was sent to England to propose a double alliance with the house of Swabia, of Frederick's son, and of Henry the Lion, with the two daughters of Henry Plantagenet. The Pope trembled at this threatened union between the houses of Swabia and England. At the great <sup>Diet at Wurtzburg, A.D. 1165, Whitsuntide.</sup> diet held at Wurtzburg, Frederick asserted the canonical election of Paschal III., the new Antipope, and declared in the face of the empire and of all Christendom, that the powerful kingdom of England had now embraced his cause, and that the

---

<sup>s</sup> Bouquet, xvi. 256.

King of France stood alone in his support of Alexander.<sup>h</sup> In his public edict he declared to all Christendom that the oath of fidelity to Paschal, of denial of all future allegiance to Alexander, administered to all the great princes and prelates of the empire, had been taken by the ambassadors of King Henry, Richard of Ilchester, and John of Oxford.<sup>i</sup> Nor was this all. A solemn oath of abjuration of Pope Alexander was enacted, and to some extent enforced; it was to be taken by every male over twelve years old throughout the realm.<sup>k</sup> The King's officers compelled this act of obedience to the King, in villages, in castles, in cities.

If the ambassadors of Henry at Wurtzburg had full powers to transfer the allegiance of the King to the Antipope; if they took the oath unconditionally, and

<sup>h</sup> The letters of John of Salisbury are full of allusions to the proceedings at Wurtzburg.—Bouquet, p. 524. John of Oxford is said to have denied the oath (p. 533); also Giles, iv. 264. He is from that time branded by John of Salisbury as an arch liar.

<sup>i</sup> John of Oxford was rewarded for this service by the deanery of Salisbury, vacant by the promotion of the dean to the bishopric of Bayeux. Joscelin, Bishop of Salisbury, notwithstanding the papal prohibition that no election should take place in the absence of some of the canons, chose the safer course of obedience to the King's mandate. This act of Joscelin was deeply resented by Becket. John of Oxford's usurpation of the deanery was one of the causes assigned for his excommunication at Vezelay. See also, on the loyal but somewhat unscrupulous proceedings of John of Oxford, the letter (hereafter referred to) of Nicolas de

Monte Rotomagensi. It describes the attempt of John of Oxford to prepossess the Empress Matilda against Becket. It likewise betrays again the double-dealing of the Bishop of Lisieux, outwardly for the King, secretly a partisan and adviser of Becket. On the whole, it shows the moderation and good sense of the empress, who disapproved of some of the Constitutions, and especially of their being written, but speaks strongly of the abuses in the Church. Nicolas admires her skilfulness in defending her son.—Giles, iv. 187. Bouquet, 226.

<sup>k</sup> “*Præcepit enim publicè et compulit per vicos, per castella, per civitates ab homine sene usque ad puerum duodenum beati Petri successorem Alexandrum aljurare.*” William of Canterbury alone of Becket's biographers (Giles, ii. p. 19) asserts this, but it is unanswerably confirmed by Becket's Letter 78, iii. p. 192.

with no reserve in case Alexander should abandon the cause of Becket; if this oath of abjuration in England was generally administered; it is clear that Henry soon changed, or wavered at least in his policy. The alliance between the two houses came to nothing. Yet even after this he addressed another letter to Reginald, Archbishop of Cologne, declaring again his long cherished determination to abandon the cause of Alexander, the supporter of his enemy, the Archbishop of Canterbury. He demanded safe-conduct for an embassy to Rome, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, John of Oxford, De Laci, the Justiciary, peremptorily to require the Pope to annul all the acts of Thomas, and to command the observance of the Customs.<sup>m</sup> The success of Alexander in Italy, aversion in England to the abjuration of Alexander, some unaccounted jealousy with the Emperor, irresolution in Henry, which was part of his impetuous character, may have wrought this change.

The monk and severe student of Pontigny found rest neither in his austerities nor his studies.<sup>n</sup> The causes of this enforced repose are manifest—the negotiations between Henry and the Emperor, the uncertainty of the success of the Pope on his return to Italy. It would have been perilous policy, either for him to risk, or for the Pope not to inhibit any rash measure.

In the second year of his seclusion, when he found

<sup>m</sup> The letter in Giles (vi. 279) is rather perplexing. It is placed by Bouquet, agreeing with Baronius, in 1166; by Von Raumer (*Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*, ii. p. 192) in 1165, before the Diet of Wurtzburg. This cannot be right, as the letter implies that Alexander was in Rome, where he arrived not before Nov. 1165. The

embassy, though it seems that the Emperor granted the safe-conduct, did not take place, at least as regards some of the ambassadors.

<sup>n</sup> “Itaque per biennium fermè stetit.” So writes Roger of Pontigny. It is difficult to make out so long time.—p. 154.

that the King's heart was still hardened, the fire, not, we are assured by his followers, of resentment, but of parental love, not zeal for vengeance but for justice, burned within his soul. Henry was at this time in France. Three times the exile cited his sovereign with the tone of a superior to submit to his censure. Becket had communicated his design to his followers:—"Let us act as the Lord commanded his steward: 'See, I have set thee over the nations, and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy, and to hew down, to build and to plant.'"<sup>p</sup> All his hearers applauded his righteous resolution. In the first message the haughty meaning was veiled in the blandest words,<sup>q</sup> and sent by a Cistercian of gentle demeanour, named Urban.<sup>r</sup> The King returned a short and bitter answer. The second time Becket wrote in severer language, but yet in the spirit, 'tis said, of compassion and leniency.<sup>s</sup> The King deigned no reply. His third messenger was a tattered, barefoot friar. To him Becket, it might seem, with studied insult, not only entrusted his letter to the King, but authorised the friar to speak in his name. With such a messenger the message was not likely to lose in asperity. The King returned an answer even more contemptuous than the address.<sup>t</sup>

But this secret arraignment of the King did not content the unquiet prelate. He could now dare more, unrestrained, unrebuked. Pope Alexander had been

<sup>o</sup> Herbert de Bosham.—p. 226.

<sup>p</sup> Jer. i. 10.

<sup>q</sup> "Suavissimas literas, supplicationem solam, correptionem vero nullam vel modicam continentes."—De Bosham.

<sup>r</sup> Urbane by disposition as by name.

—Ibid.

<sup>s</sup> Giles, iii. 365. Bouquet, p. 243.

<sup>t</sup> "Quin potius dura propinantes, dura pro duris, immo multo plus duriora prioribus, reportaverunt."—De Bosham.

received at Rome with open arms: at the commencement of the present year all seemed to favour Nov. 11, 1165. his cause. The Emperor, detained by wars in Germany, was not prepared to cross the Alps. In the free cities of Italy, the anti-imperialist feeling, and the growing republicanism, gladly entered into close confederacy with a Pope at war with the Emperor. The Pontiff (secretly it should seem, it might be in defiance or in revenge for Henry's threatened revolt and for the acts of his ambassadors at Wurtzburg<sup>u</sup>) ventured to grant to Becket a legatine power over the King's English dominions, except the province of York. Though it was not in the power of Becket to enter those dominions, it armed him, as it was thought, with unquestionable authority over Henry and his subjects. At all events it annulled whatever restraint the Pope, by counsel or by mandate, had placed on the proceedings of Becket.<sup>x</sup> The Archbishop took his determination alone.<sup>y</sup> As though to throw an awful mystery about

\* The Pope had written (Jan. 28) to the bishops of England not to presume to act without the consent of Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. April 5, he forbade Roger of York and the other prelates to crown the King's son. May 3, he writes to Foliot and the bishops who had received benefices of the King to surrender them under pain of anathema; to Becket in favour of Joscelin, Bishop of Salisbury: he had annulled the grant of the deanery of Salisbury to John of Oxford. May 10, to the Archbishop of Rouen, denouncing the dealings of Henry with the Emperor and the Antipope.—Giles, iv. 10 & 80. Bouquet, 246.

<sup>x</sup> The inhibition given at Sens to

proceed against the King, before the Easter of the following year (A.D. 1166), had now expired. Moreover he had a direct commission to proceed by Commination against those who forcibly withheld the property of the see of Canterbury.—Apud Giles, iv. 8. Bouquet, xvi. 844. At the same time the Pope urged great discretion as to the King's person.—Giles, iv. 12. Bouquet, 244.

<sup>y</sup> At the same time Becket wrote to Foliot of London, commanding him under penalty of excommunication to transmit to him the sequestered revenues of Canterbury in his hands.—Foliot appealed to the Pope.—Foliot's Letter. Giles, vi. 5. Bouquet, 215.

his plan, he called his wise friends together, and consulted them on the propriety of resigning his see. With one voice they rejected the timid counsel. Yet though his most intimate followers were in ignorance of his designs, some intelligence of a meditated blow was betrayed to Henry. The King summoned an assembly of prelates at Chinon. The Bishops of Lisieux and Seez, whom the Archbishop of Rouen, Rotran, consented to accompany as a mediator, were despatched to Pontigny, to anticipate by an appeal to the Pope, any sentence which might be pronounced by Becket. They did not find him there: he had already gone to Soissons, on the pretext of a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Drausus, a saint whose intercession rendered the warrior invincible in battle. Did Becket hope thus to secure victory in the great spiritual combat? One whole night he passed before the shrine of St. Drausus: another before that of Gregory the Great, the founder of the English Church, and of the see of Canterbury; a third before that of the Virgin, his especial patroness.

From thence he proceeded to the ancient and famous monastery of Vezelay.<sup>2</sup> The church of Veze-  
lay, if the dismal decorations of the archi-  
Becket at  
Vezelay.  
tecture are (which is doubtful) of that period, might seem designated for that fearful ceremony.<sup>a</sup> There, on

\* The curious History of the Monastery of Vezelay, by Hugh of Poitiers (translated in Guizot, Collection des Mémoires), though it twice mentions Becket, stops just short of this excommunication, 1166. Vezelay boasted to be subject only to the See of Rome, to have been made by its founder part of the patrimony of St. Peter. This was one great distinction: the other was the unquestioned possession of the body

of St. Mary Magdalene, “l'amie de Dieu.” Vezelay had been in constant strife with the Bishop of Autun for its ecclesiastical, with the Count of Nevers for its territorial independence; with the monastery of Clugny, as its rival. This is a document very instructive as to the life of the age.

\* A modern traveller thus writes of the church of Vezelay: “On voit par le choix des sujets qui ont un sens, quel

the feast of the Ascension,<sup>b</sup> when the church was crowded with worshippers from all quarters, he ascended the pulpit, and, with the utmost solemnity, condemned and annulled the Constitutions of Clarendon, declared excommunicate all who observed or enforced their observance, all who had counselled, and all who had defended them; absolved all the bishops from the oaths which they had taken to maintain them. This sweeping anathema involved the whole kingdom. But he proceeded to excommunicate by name his most active and powerful adversaries: John of Oxford, for his dealings with the schismatic partisans of the Emperor and of the Antipope, and for his usurpation of the deanery of Salisbury; Richard of Ilchester Archdeacon of Poitiers, the colleague of John in his negotiations at Wurtzburg (thus the cause of Becket and Pope Alexander were

était l'esprit du temps et la manière d'interpréter la religion. Ce n'était pas par la douceur ou la persuasion qu'on voulait convertir, mais bien par la terreur. Les discours des prêtres pourraient se résumer en ce peu de mots : "Croyez, ou sinon vous périssez misérablement, et vous serez éternellement tourmentés dans l'autre monde!"

De leur côté, les artistes, gens religieux, ecclésiastiques même pour la plupart, donnaient une forme réelle aux sombres images que leur inspirait un zèle farouche. Je ne trouve à Vezelay aucun de ces sujets que les ames tendres aimeraient à retracer, tels que le pardon accordé au repentir, la récompense du juste, etc.; mais, au contraire, je vois Samuel égorgéant Agag; des diables écartelant des damnés, ou les entraînant dans l'abîme; puis des animaux horribles, des mon-

stres hideux, des têtes grimaçantes exprimant ou les souffrances des réprobés, ou la joie des habitans de l'enfer. Qu'on se représente la dévotion des hommes élevés au milieu de ces images, et l'on s'étonnera moins des massacres des Albigeois."—Notes d'un Voyage dans le Midi de la France, par Prosper Mérimée, p. 43.

<sup>b</sup> Diceto gives the date Ascension Day, Herbert de Bosham St. Mary Magdalene's Day (July 22nd). It should seem that De Bosham's memory failed him. See the letter of Nicolas de M. Rotomagensi, who speaks of the excommunication as past, and that Becket was expected to excommunicate *the King* on St. Mary Magdalene's Day. This, if done at Vezelay (as it were, over the body of the Saint, on her sacred day), had been tenfold more awful.

indissolubly welded together); the great Justiciary, Richard de Lucy, and John of Baliol, the authors of the Constitutions of Clarendon; Randolph de Broc, Hugo de Clare, and others, for their forcible usurpation of the estates of the see of Canterbury. He yet in his mercy spared the King (he had received intelligence that Henry was dangerously ill), and in a lower tone, his voice, as it seemed, half choked with tears, he uttered his Commination. The whole congregation, even his own intimate followers, were silent with amazement.

This sentence of excommunication Becket announced to the Pope, and to all the clergy of England. To the latter he said, “Who presumes to doubt that the priests of God are the fathers and masters of kings, princes, and all the faithful?” He commanded Gilbert, Bishop of London, and his other suffragans, to publish this edict throughout their dioceses. He did not confine himself to the bishops of England; the Norman prelates, the Archbishop of Rouen, were expressly warned to withdraw from all communion with the excommunicate.<sup>c</sup>

The wrath of Henry drove him almost to madness. No one dared to name Becket in his presence.<sup>d</sup> Soon after, on the occasion of some discussion <sup>Anger of  
the King.</sup> about the King of Scotland, he burst into a fit of passion, threw away his cap, ungirt his belt, stripped off his clothes, tore the silken coverlid from his bed, and crouched down on the straw, gnawing bits of it with his teeth.<sup>e</sup> Proclamation was issued to guard the ports of

<sup>a</sup> See the curious letter of Nicolas de Monte Rotomagensi, Giles, iv., Bouquet, 250. This measure of Becket was imputed by the Archbishop of Rheims to pride or anger (“extollen-  
tis aut ire”); it made an unfavourable impression on the Empress Matilda. —Ibid.

<sup>b</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. 185; Bouquet, 258.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. 280; Bouquet, 256.

England against the threatened interdict. Any one who should be apprehended as the bearer of such an instrument, if a regular, was to lose his feet; if a clerk, his eyes, and suffer more shameful mutilation; a layman was to be hanged; a leper to be burned. A bishop who left the kingdom, for fear of the interdict, was to carry nothing with him but his staff. All exiles were to return on pain of losing their benefices. Priests who refused to chant the service were to be mutilated, and all rebels to forfeit their lands. An oath was to be administered by the sheriffs to all adults, that they would respect no ecclesiastical censure from the Archbishop.

A second time Henry's ungovernable passion betrayed him into a step which, instead of lowering, only placed his antagonist in a more formidable position. He determined to drive him from his retreat at Pontigny. <sup>Becket driven from Pontigny.</sup> He sent word to the general of the Cistercian order, that it was at their peril, if they harboured a traitor to his throne. The Cistercians possessed many rich abbeys in England; they dared not defy at once the King's resentment and rapacity. It was intimated to the Abbot of Pontigny, that he must dismiss his guest. The Abbot courteously communicated to Becket the danger incurred by the Order. He could not but withdraw; but instead now of lurking in a remote monastery, in some degree secluded from the public gaze, he was received in the archiepiscopal city of Sens; his honourable residence was prepared in a monastery close to the city; he lived in ostentatious communication with the Archbishop William, one of his most zealous partisans.<sup>f</sup>

---

<sup>f</sup> Herbert de Bosham, p. 232.

But the fury of haughtiness in Becket equalled the fury of resentment in the King: yet it was not without subtlety. Just before the scene at Vezelay, it has been said, the King had sent the Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishop of Lisieux to Pontigny, to lodge his appeal to the Pope. Becket, duly informed by his emissaries at the court, had taken care to be absent. He eluded likewise the personal service of the appeal of the English clergy. An active and violent correspondence ensued. The remonstrance, purporting to be from the Primate's suffragans and the whole clergy of England, was not without dignified calmness. With covert irony, indeed, they said that they had derived great consolation from the hope that, when abroad, he would cease to rebel against the King and the peace of the realm; that he would devote his days to study and prayer, and redeem his lost time by fasting, watching, and weeping; they reproached him with the former favours of the King, with the design of estranging the King from Pope Alexander; they asserted the readiness of the King to do full justice, and concluded by lodging an appeal until the Ascension-day of the following year.<sup>g</sup> Foliot was no doubt the author of this remonstrance, and between the Primate and the Bishop of London broke out a fierce warfare of letters. With Foliot Becket kept no terms. "You complain that the Bishop of Salisbury has been excommunicated, without citation, without hearing, without judgement. Remember the fate of Ucalegon. He trembled when his neighbour's house was on fire." To Foliot he asserted the pre-eminence, the supremacy, the divinity of the spiritual power without reserve. "Let

<sup>g</sup> Epist. Giles, vi. 158; Bouquet, 259.

not your liege lord be ashamed to defer to those to whom God himself defers, and calls them ‘Gods.’”<sup>h</sup> Foliot replied with what may be received as the manifesto of his party, and as the manifesto of a party to be received with some mistrust, yet singularly curious, as showing the tone of defence taken by the opponents of the Primate among the English clergy.<sup>i</sup>

The address of the English prelates to Pope Alexander was more moderate, and drawn with great ability. It asserted the justice, the obedience to the Church, the great virtue and (a bold assertion !) the conjugal fidelity of the King. The King had at once obeyed the citation of the Bishops of London and Salisbury, concerning some encroachments on the Church condemned by the Pope. The sole design of Henry had been to promote good morals, and to maintain the peace of the realm. That peace had been restored. All resentments had died away, when Becket fiercely recommenced the strife; in sad and terrible letters had threatened the King with excommunication, the realm with interdict. He had suspended the Bishop of Salisbury without trial. “This was the whole of the cruelty, perversity, malignity of the King against the Church, declaimed on and bruited abroad throughout the world.”<sup>k</sup>

The indefatigable John of Oxford was in Rome,

<sup>h</sup> “Non indignetur itaque Dominus noster deferre illis, quibus summus omnium deferre non designatur, Deos appellans eos saepius in sacris literis.

Sic enim dixit, ‘Ego dixi, Dii estis,’ et ‘Constitui te Deum Pharaonis,’ et ‘Deis non detrahere.’”—Epist. Giles, iii. p. 287; Bouquet, 261.

<sup>i</sup> Foliot took the precaution of paying into the exchequer all that he

had received from the sequestered property of the see of Canterbury.—Giles, v. p. 265. Lyttelton in Appendix.

<sup>k</sup> “Hæc est Domini regis toto orbe declamata crudelitas, hæc ab eo persecutio, hæc operum ejus perversorum rumusculis undique divulgata malitia.”—Giles, vi. 190; Bouquet, 265.

perhaps the bearer of this address. Becket wrote to the Pope, insisting on all the cruelties of the King: he calls him a malignant tyrant, one full of all malice. He dwelt especially on the imprisonment of one of his chaplains, for which violation of the sacred person of a clerk, the King was *ipso facto* excommunicate. "Christ was crucified anew in Becket."<sup>m</sup> He complained of the presumption of Foliot, who had usurped the power of primate;<sup>n</sup> warned the Pope of the wiles of John of Oxford; deprecated the legatine mission, of which he had already heard a rumour, of William of Pavia. And all these letters, so unsparing to the King, or copies of them, probably bought out of the Roman chancery, were regularly transmitted to the King.

John of Oxford began his mission at Rome by swearing undauntedly, that nothing had been done at Wurtzburg against the power of the Church or the interests of Pope Alexander.<sup>o</sup> He surrendered his deanery of Salis-

<sup>m</sup> Giles, iii. 6; Bouquet, 266. Compare letter of Bishop Elect of Chartres.

<sup>n</sup> Giles, vi. 211; Bouquet, 269.

<sup>o</sup> Foliot obtained letters either at this time or somewhat later from his own Chapter of St. Paul, from many of the greatest dignitaries of the English Church, the abbots of Westminster and Reading, and from some distinguished foreign ecclesiastics, in favour of himself, his piety, churchmanship, and impartiality.

<sup>o</sup> The German accounts are unanimous about the proceedings at Wurtzburg and the oath of the English ambassadors. See the account in Von Raumer (*loc. cit.*), especially of the conduct of Reginald of Cologne, and

the authorities. John of Oxford is henceforth called, in John of Salisbury's letters, jurator. Becket repeatedly charges him with perjury.—Giles, iii. p. 129 and 351; Bouquet, 280. Becket there says that John of Oxford had given up part of the "customs." He begs John of Poitiers to let the King know this. See the very curious answer of John of Poitiers.—Giles, vi. 251; Bouquet, 280. It appears that as all Becket's letters to the Pope were copied and transmitted from Rome to Henry, so John of Poitiers, outwardly the King's loyal subject, is the secret spy of Becket. He speaks of those in England who thirst after Becket's blood.

John of  
Oxford  
at Rome.

bury into the hands of the Pope, and received it back again.<sup>p</sup> John of Oxford was armed with more powerful weapons than perjury or submission, and the times now favoured the use of these more irresistible arms. The Emperor Frederick was levying, if he had not already set in motion, that mighty army which swept, during the next year, through Italy, made him master of Rome, and witnessed his coronation and the enthronement of the Antipope.<sup>q</sup> Henry had now, notwithstanding his suspicious—more than suspicious—dealings with the Emperor, returned to his allegiance to Alexander. Vast sums of English money were from this time expended in strengthening the cause of the Pope. The Guelfic cities of Italy received them with greedy hands. By the gold of the King of England, and of the King of Sicily, the Frangipani and the family of Peter Leonis were retained in their fidelity to the Pope. Becket, on the other hand, had powerful friends in Rome, especially the Cardinal Hyacinth, to whom he writes, that Henry had boasted that in Rome everything was venal.

It was, however, not till a second embassy  
<sup>Dec. 1166.</sup> arrived, consisting of John Cummin and Ralph of Tamworth, that Alexander made his great concession, the sign that he was not yet extricated from his distress. He appointed William of Pavia, and Otho, Cardinal of St. Nicolas, his legates in France, to decide the cause.<sup>r</sup> Meantime all Becket's acts were suspended by the papal authority. At the same time the Pope wrote to Becket,

<sup>p</sup> The Pope acknowledges that this was extorted from him by fear of Henry, and makes an awkward apology to Becket.—Giles, iv. 18; Bouquet, 309.

<sup>q</sup> He was crowned in Rome August 1. Compare next chapter.—Sismondi, R6

publiques Italiennes, ii. ch. x.; Von Raumer, ii. p. 209, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Giles, iii. 128; Bouquet, 272. Compare Letters to Cardinals Boso and Henry.—Giles, iii. 103, 113; Bouquet, 174. Letter to Henry announcing the appointment, December 20.

entreating him at this perilous time of the Church to make all possible concessions, and to dissemble, if necessary, for the present.<sup>s</sup>

If John of Oxford boasted prematurely of his triumph (on his return to England he took ostentatious possession of his deanery of Salisbury<sup>t</sup>), and predicted the utter ruin of Becket, his friends, especially the King of France,<sup>u</sup> were in utter dismay at this change in the papal policy. John, as Becket had heard (and his emissaries were everywhere), on his landing in England, had met the Bishop of Hereford (one of the wavering bishops), prepared to cross the sea in obedience to Becket's citation. To him, after some delay, John had exhibited letters of the Pope, which sent him back to his diocese. On the sight of these same letters, the Bishop of London had exclaimed in the fulness of his joy, "Then our Thomas is no longer archbishop!" "If this be true," adds Becket, "the Pope has given a deathblow to the Church."<sup>v</sup> To the Archbishop of Mentz, for in the empire he had his ardent admirers, he poured forth all the bitterness of his soul.<sup>w</sup> Of the two cardinals he writes, "The one is weak and versatile, the other treacherous and crafty." He looked to their arrival with indignant apprehension. They are open to bribes, and may be perverted to any injustice.<sup>x</sup>

<sup>s</sup> "Si non omnia secundum beneficium placitum succedant, ad praesens dissimulet." — Giles, vi. 15; Bouquet, 277.

<sup>t</sup> See the curious letter of Master Lombard, Becket's instructor in the canon law, who boldly remonstrates with the Pope. He asserts that Henry was so frightened at the menace of excommunication, his subjects, even the bishops, at that of his interdict,

that they were in despair. Their only hope was in the death or some great disaster of the Pope. —Giles, iv. 208; Bouquet, 282.

<sup>u</sup> See Letters of Louis; Giles, iv. 308; Bouquet, 287.

<sup>v</sup> "Strangulavit," a favourite word —Giles, iii. 214; Bouquet, 284.

<sup>w</sup> Giles, iii. 235; Bouquet, 285.

<sup>x</sup> Compare John of Salisbury, p. 539. "Scripsit autem rex Domino Coloniensi,

John of Oxford had proclaimed that the cardinals, William of Pavia, and Otho, were invested in full powers to pass judgement between the King and the Primate.\* But whether John of Oxford had mistaken or exaggerated their powers, or the Pope (no improbable case, considering the change of affairs in Italy) had thought fit afterwards to modify or retract them, they came rather as mediators than judges, with orders to reconcile the contending parties, rather than to decide on their cause. The cardinals did not arrive in France till the autumn of the year.<sup>b</sup> Even before their arrival, first rumours, then more certain intelligence had been propagated throughout Christendom of the terrible disaster which had befallen the Emperor. Barbarossa's career of ven-

<sup>A.D. 1167. Flight of Frederick.</sup> geance and conquest had been cut short. The Pope a prisoner, a fugitive, was unexpectedly released, restored to power, if not to the possession of Rome.<sup>c</sup> The climate of Rome, as usual, but in a far

Henricum Pisanum et Willelmum Papiensem in Franciam venturos ad novas exactiones faciendas, ut undique conradant et contrahant, unde Papa Alexander in urbe sustentetur: alter, ut nostis, levis est et mutabilis, alter dolosus et fraudulentus, uterque cupidus et avarus: et ideo de facili munera cœnabunt eos et ad omnem injustitiam incurvabunt. Auditore eorum detestando adventu formidare coepi præsentiam eorum causæ vestræ multum nocitaram; et ne vestro et vestrorum sanguine gratiam Regis Angliæ redimere non erubescant." He refers with great joy to the insurrection of the Saxons against the Emperor. He says elsewhere of Henry of Pisa: "Vir bona opinionis est, sed Romanus at Cardinalis."—Epist. cc. ii.

\* The English Bishops declare to the Pope himself that they had received this concession, *scripto formatum*, from the Pope, and that the King was furious at what he thought a deception.—Giles, vi. 194; Bouquet, 304.

<sup>b</sup> The Pope wrote to the legates to soothe Becket and the King of France; he accuses John of Oxford of spreading false reports about the extent of their commission; John Cummin of betraying his letters to the Antipope.—Giles, vi. 54.

<sup>c</sup> So completely does Becket's fortune follow that of the Pope, that on June 17 Alexander writes to permit Roger of York to crown the King's son; no sooner is he safe in Benevento, August 22 (perhaps the fever had

more fearful manner, had resented the invasion of the city by the German army. A pestilence had broken out, which in less than a month made such havoc among the soldiers, that they could scarcely find room to bury the dead. The fever seemed to choose its victims among the higher clergy, the partisans of the Antipope; of the princes and nobles, the chief victims were the younger Duke Guelf, Duke Frederick of Swabia, and some others; of the bishops, those of Prague, Ratisbon, Augsburg, Spires, Verdun, Liège, Zeitz; and the arch-rebel himself, the antipope-maker, Reginald of Cologne.<sup>a</sup> Throughout Europe the clergy on the side of Alexander raised a cry of awful exultation; it was God manifestly avenging himself on the enemies of the Church; the new Sennacherib (so he is called by Becket) had been smitten in his pride; and the example of this chastisement of Frederick was a command to the Church to resist to the last all rebels against her power, to put forth her spiritual arms, which God would as assuredly support by the same or more signal wonders. The defeat of Frederick was an admonition to the Pope to lay bare the sword of Peter, and smite on all sides.<sup>b</sup>

There can be no doubt that Becket so interpreted what he deemed a sign from heaven. But, even before the disaster was certainly known, he had determined to show no submission to a judge so partial and so

Becket  
against the  
legates.

begun), than he writes to his legates to confirm the excommunications of Becket, which he had suspended.

<sup>a</sup> Muratori, sub ann. 1167; Von Raumer, ii. 210. On the 1st of August Frederick was crowned; September 4, he is at the Pass of Pontremoli, in full retreat, or rather flight.

\* In a curious passage in a letter

written by Herbert de Bosham in the name of Becket, Frederick's defeat is compared to Henry's disgraceful campaign in Wales. "My enemy," says Becket, "in the abundance of his valour, could not prevail against a breechesless and ragged people ('exbraccatum et pannosum')."—Giles, viii. p. 268.

corrupt as William of Pavia.<sup>f</sup> That cardinal had urged the Pope at Sens to accept Becket's resignation of his see. Becket would not deign to disguise his contempt. He wrote a letter so full of violence, that John of Salisbury,<sup>g</sup> to whom it was submitted, persuaded him to destroy it. A second was little milder; at length he was persuaded to take a more moderate tone. Yet even then he speaks of the "insolence of princes lifting up their horn." To Cardinal Otho, on the other hand, his language borders on adulation.

The cardinal Legates travelled in slow state. They  
<sup>Meeting near Gisors.</sup> visited first Becket at Sens, afterwards King Henry at Rouen. At length a meeting was agreed on to be held on the borders of the French and English territory, between Gisors and Trie. The proud Becket was disturbed at being hastily summoned, when he was unable to muster a sufficient retinue of horsemen to meet the Italian cardinals. The two kings were there. Of Henry's prelates the Archbishop of Rouen alone was present at the first interview. Becket was charged with urging the King of France to war against his master. On the following day the King of France said in the presence of the cardinals, that this  
<sup>Octave of St. Martin. Nov. 23.</sup> impeachment on Becket's loyalty was false. To all the persuasions, menaces, entreaties of the cardinals,<sup>h</sup> Becket declared that he would submit, "saving the honour of God, and of the Apostolic See,

<sup>f</sup> "Credimus non esse juri consenteum, nos ejus subire judicium vel examen qui querit sibi facere commercium de sanguine nostro, de pretio utinam non iniquitatis, querit sibi nomen et gloriam."—D. Thom. Epist. Giles, iii. p. 15. The two legates are described as "plus avaritia quam

justitiae studiosi."—W. Cant. p. 21.

<sup>g</sup> Giles, iii. 157, and John of Salisbury's remarkable expostulatory letter upon Becket's violence.—Bouquet, p. 566.

<sup>h</sup> Herbert de Bosham, p. 248; Epist. Giles, iii. 16; Bouquet, 296.

the liberty of the Church, the dignity of his person, and the property of the churches. As to the Customs he declared that he would rather bow his neck to the executioner than swear to observe them. He peremptorily demanded his own restoration at once to all the honours and possessions of the see." The third question was on the appeal of the bishops. Becket inveighed with bitterness on their treachery towards him, their servility to the King. "When the shepherds fled all Egypt returned to idolatry." Becket interpreted these "shepherds" as the clergy.<sup>1</sup> He compares them to the slaves in the old comedy; he declared that he would submit to no judgement on that point but that of the Pope himself.

The Cardinals proceeded to the King. They were received but coldly at Argences, not far from Caen, at a great meeting with the Norman and English prelates. The Bishop of London entered at length into the King's grievances and his own; Becket's debt to the King,<sup>k</sup> his usurpations on the see of London. At the close Henry, in tears, entreated the cardinals to rid him of the troublesome churchman. William of Pavia wept, or seemed to weep from sympathy. Otho, writes Becket's emissary, could hardly suppress his laughter. The English prelates afterwards at Le Mans solemnly renewed their appeal. Their appeal was accompanied with a letter, in which they complain that Becket would leave them exposed to the wrath of the King, from which wrath he himself had fled;<sup>m</sup> of false representations of the Customs, and dis-

<sup>1</sup> Giles, iii. p. 21. Compare the whole letter.

washed away in baptism, so debts are cancelled by promotion."

<sup>k</sup> Foliot rather profanely said, "The primate seems to think that as sin is

<sup>m</sup> "Ad mortem nos invitit et sanguinis effusionem cum ipse mortem,

regard of all justice and of the sacred canons in suspending and anathematising the clergy without hearing and without trial. William of Pavia gave notice of the appeal for the next St. Martin's Day (so a year was to elapse), with command to abstain from all excommunication and interdict of the kingdom till that day.<sup>n</sup> Both cardinals wrote strongly to the Pope in favour of the Bishop of London.<sup>o</sup>

At this suspension Becket wrote to the Pope in a tone of mingled grief and indignation.<sup>p</sup> He described himself as the most wretched of men ; applied the prophetic description of the Saviour's unequalled sorrow to himself. He inveighed against William of Pavia :<sup>q</sup> he threw himself on the justice and compassion of the

Pope. But this inhibition was confirmed by

Dec. 29. the Pope himself, in answer to another embassy of Henry, consisting of Clarembold, Prior Elect of St. Augustine's, the Archdeacon of Salisbury, and others.<sup>r</sup> This important favour was obtained through the interest of Cardinal John of Naples, who expresses his hope that the insolent Archbishop must at length see that he had no resource but in submission.

Becket wrote again and again to the Pope, bitterly complaining that the successive ambassadors of the

quam nemo sibi dignabatur aut min-  
abatur inferre, summo studio de-  
clinaverit et suum sanguinem illibatum  
conservando, ejus nec guttam effundi  
voluerit."—Giles, vi. 196. Bouquet,  
304.

<sup>n</sup> Giles, vi. 148. Bouquet, 304.

<sup>o</sup> Giles, vi. 135, 141. Bouquet,  
306. William of Pavia recommended  
the translation of Becket to some other  
see.

<sup>p</sup> Giles, iii. 28. Bouquet, 306.

<sup>q</sup> One of his letters to William of Pavia begins with this fierce denunciation : " Non credebam me tibi venalem proponendum emptoribus, ut de sanguine meo compareres tibi compendium de pretio iniquitatis, faciens tibi nomen et gloriam."—Giles, iii. 153. Becket always represents his enemies as thirsting after his blood.

<sup>r</sup> Giles, iv. 128; vi. 188. Bouquet,  
312, 313.

King, John of Oxford, John Cummin, the Prior of St. Augustine's, returned from Rome each with <sup>May 19.</sup> <sup>Becket to the Pope.</sup> larger concessions.<sup>\*</sup> The Pope acknowledged that the concessions had been extorted from him. The ambassadors of Henry had threatened to leave the Papal Court, if their demands were not complied with, in open hostility. The Pope was still an exile in Benevento,<sup>t</sup> and did not dare to reoccupy Rome. The Emperor, even after his discomfiture, was still formidable; he might collect another overwhelming Transalpine force. The subsidies of Henry to the Italian cities and to the Roman partisans of the Pope could not be spared. The Pontiff therefore wrote soothing letters to the King of France and to Becket. He insinuated that these concessions were but for a time. "For a time!" replied Becket in an answer full of fire and passion: "and in that time the Church of England falls utterly to ruin; the property of the Church and the poor is wrested from her. In that time prelacies and abbacies are confiscated to the King's use: in that time who will guard the flock when the wolf is in the fold? This fatal dispensation will be a precedent for all ages. But for me and my fellow exiles all authority of Rome had ceased for ever in England. There had been no one who had maintained the Pope against kings and princes." His significant language involves the Pope himself in the general and unsparing charge of rapacity and venality with which he brands the court of Rome. "I shall have to give an account at the last day, where gold and silver are of no avail, nor gifts which blind the

\* Epist. Giles, ii. 24.

<sup>t</sup> He was at Benevento, though with different degrees of power, from Aug. 22, 1167, to Feb. 24, 1170.

eyes even of the wise."<sup>a</sup> The same contemptuous allusions to that notorious venality transpire in a vehement letter addressed to the College of Cardinals,  
<sup>To the</sup>  
<sup>Cardinals.</sup> in which he urges that his cause is their own; that they are sanctioning a fatal and irretrievable example to temporal princes; that they are abrogating all obedience to the Church. "Your gold and silver will not deliver you in the day of the wrath of the Lord."<sup>x</sup> On the other hand, the King and the Queen of France wrote in a tone of indignant remonstrance that the Pope had abandoned the cause of the enemy of their enemy. More than one of the French prelates who wrote in the same strain declared that their King, in his resentment, had seriously thought of defection to the Antipope, and of a close connexion with the Imperial family.<sup>y</sup> Alexander determined to make another attempt at reconciliation; at least he should gain time, that precious source of hope to the embarrassed and irresolute. His mediators were the Prior of Montdieu and Bernard de Corilo, a monk of Grammont.<sup>z</sup> It was a fortunate time, for just at this juncture, peace and even amity seemed to be established between the Kings of France and England. Many of the great Norman and French prelates and nobles offered themselves as joint mediators with the commissioners of the Pope.

A vast assembly was convened on the day of the Epiphany in the plains near Montmirail,  
<sup>Meeting</sup>  
<sup>at Mont-</sup>  
<sup>mirail.</sup> where in the presence of the two kings and the barons of each realm the reconciliation was to take

<sup>a</sup> Giles, iii. p. 55. Bouquet, 317. Read the whole letter beginning "Anima mea."

<sup>x</sup> Bouquet, 324.

<sup>y</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. Bouquet, 320.

<sup>z</sup> Their instructions are dated May 25, 1168. See also the wavering letters to Becket and the King of France.

Giles, iv. p. 25, p. 111.

place. Becket held a long conference with the mediators. He proposed, instead of the obnoxious phrase "saving my order," to substitute "saving the honour of God;" the mediators of the treaty insisted on his throwing himself on the King's mercy absolutely and without reservation. With great reluctance Becket appeared at least to yield:<sup>a</sup> his counsellors acquiesced in silence. With this distinct understanding the Kings of France and England met at Montmirail, and everything seemed prepared for the final settlement of this long and obstinate quarrel. The Kings awaited Jan. 6, 1169. the approach of the Primate. But as he was on his way, De Bosham (who always assumes to himself the credit of suggesting Becket's most haughty proceedings) whispered in his ear (De Bosham himself asserts this) a solemn caution, lest he should act over again the fatal scene of weakness at Clarendon. Becket had not time to answer De Bosham: he advanced to the King and threw himself at his feet. Henry raised him instantly from the ground. Becket, standing upright, began to solicit the clemency of the King. He declared his readiness to submit his whole cause to the judgement of the two Kings and of the assembled prelates and nobles. After a pause, he added, "Saving the honour of God."<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> "Sed quid? Nobis ita consilium suspendentibus et hæsitantibus quid agendum a pacis mediatoribus, multis et magnis viris, et præsertim qui inter ipsos a viris religiosis et aliis archipræsuli amicissimis et familiarissimis, adeo sicut et supra diximus, suasus, tractus et impulsus est, ut haberetur persuasus."—De Bosham, p. 268.

<sup>b</sup> "Sed mox adjecit, quod nec rex

nec pacis mediatores, vel alii, vel etiam sui propriè testimaverunt, ut adjiceret videlicet 'Salvo honore Dei.'”—De Bosham, p. 262. In his account to the Pope of this meeting, Becket suppresses his own tergiversation on this point.—Epist. Giles, iii. p. 43. Compare John of Salisbury (who was ~~not~~ present). Bouquet, 395.

At this unexpected breach of his agreement the mediators, even the most ardent admirers of Becket, <sup>Treaty broken off.</sup> stood aghast. Henry, thinking himself duped, as well he might, broke out into one of his ungovernable fits of anger. He reproached the Archbishop with arrogance, obstinacy, and ingratitude. He so far forgot himself as to declare that Becket had displayed all his magnificence and prodigality as chancellor only to court popularity and to supplant his king in the affections of his people. Becket listened with patience, and appealed to the King of France as witness to his loyalty. Henry fiercely interrupted him. “Mark, Sire (he addressed the King of France), the infatuation and pride of the man : he pretends to have been banished, though he fled from his see. He would persuade you that he is maintaining the cause of the Church, and suffering for the sake of justice. I have always been willing, and am still willing, to grant that he should rule his Church with the same liberty as his predecessors, men not less holy than himself.” Even the King of France seemed shocked at the conduct of Becket. The prelates and nobles, having in vain laboured to bend the inflexible spirit of the Primate, retired in sullen dissatisfaction. He stood alone. Even John of Poitiers, his most ardent admirer, followed him to Etampes, and entreated him to yield. “And you, too,” returned Becket, “will you strangle us, and give triumph to the malignity of our enemies ?”<sup>c</sup>

The King of England retired, followed by the Papal Legates, who, though they held letters of Commination from the Pope,<sup>d</sup> delayed to serve them on the King.

<sup>c</sup> “Ut quid nos et vos strangulatis?”—Epist. Giles, iii. 312. | false game. He privately assured the King of France that he need not be

<sup>d</sup> Throughout the Pope kept up his | alarmed if himself (Alexander) seemed

Becket followed the King of France to Montmirail. He was received by Louis; and Becket put on so cheerful a countenance as to surprise all present. On his return to Sens, he explained to his followers that his cause was not only that of the Church, but of God.<sup>e</sup> He passed among the acclamations of the populace, ignorant of his duplicity. "Behold the prelate who stood up even before two kings for the honour of God."

Becket may have had foresight, or even secret information of the hollowness of the peace between the two kings. Before many days, some acts of barbarous cruelty by Henry against his rebellious subjects plunged the two nations again in hostility. <sup>War of France and England.</sup> The King of France and his prelates, feeling how nearly they had lost their powerful ally, began to admire what they called Becket's magnanimity as loudly as they had censured his obstinacy. The King visited him at Sens: one of the Papal commissioners, the Monk of Grammont, said privately to Herbert de Bosham, that he had rather his foot had been cut off than that Becket should have listened to his advice.<sup>f</sup>

Becket now at once drew the sword and cast away the scabbard. "Cursed is he that refraineth his sword from blood." This Becket applied to the spiritual weapon. On Ascension Day he again solemnly excommunicated Gilbert Foliot Bishop of London, Joscelin of Salisbury, the Archdeacon of Salisbury, Richard de Laci, Randolph de Broc, and many other of Henry's most faithful counsellors. He announced this excommunication to the Archbishop of

to take part against the archbishop. The cause was safe in his bosom. See the curious letter of Matthew of Sens.

—Epist. Giles, iv. p. 166.

<sup>e</sup> "Nunc praeter ecclesiæ causam, expressam ipsius etiam Dei causam agehamus."—De Bosham, 272.

<sup>f</sup> De Bosham, 278.

Rouen,<sup>g</sup> and reminded him that whosoever presumed to communicate with any one of these outlaws of the Church by word, in meat or drink, or even by salutation, subjected himself thereby to the same excommunication. The appeal to the Pope he treated with sovereign contempt. He sternly inhibited Roger of Worcester, who had entreated permission to communicate with his brethren.<sup>h</sup> "What fellowship is there between Christ and Belial?" He announced this act to the Pope, entreating, but with the tone of command, his approbation of the proceeding. An emissary of Becket had the boldness to enter St. Paul's Cathedral in London, to thrust the sentence into the hands of the officiating priest, and then to proclaim with a loud voice, "Know all men, that Gilbert Bishop of London is excommunicate by Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury and Legate of the Pope." He escaped with some difficulty from ill-usage by the people. Foliot immediately summoned his clergy; explained the illegality, injustice, nullity of an excommunication without citation, hearing, or trial, and renewed his appeal to the Pope. The Dean of St. Paul's and all the clergy, excepting the priests of certain monasteries, joined in the appeal. The Bishop of Exeter declined, nevertheless he gave to Foliot the kiss of peace.<sup>i</sup>

King Henry was not without fear at this last desperate blow. He had not a single chaplain who had not been excommunicated, or was not virtually under ban for holding intercourse with persons under excommunication.<sup>k</sup> He continued his active intrigues, his subsidies in Italy. He bought the support

<sup>g</sup> Giles, iii. 290; vi. 293. Bouquet 346. <sup>h</sup> Giles, iii. 322. Bouquet, 348

<sup>i</sup> Epist. Giles, iv. 225.

<sup>k</sup> Fragm. Vit. Giles, i. p. 371.

of Milan, Pavia, Cremona, Parma, Bologna. The Frangipani, the family of Leo, the people of Rome, were still kept in allegiance to the Pope chiefly by his lavish payments.<sup>m</sup> He made overtures to the King of Sicily, the Pope's ally, for a matrimonial alliance with his family: and finally, he urged the tempting offer to mediate a peace between the Emperor and the Pope. Reginald of Salisbury boasted that, if the Pope should die, Henry had the whole College of Cardinals in his pay, and could name his Pope.<sup>n</sup>

But no longer dependent on Henry's largesses to his partisans, Alexander's affairs wore a more prosperous aspect. He began, yet cautiously, to show his real bias. He determined to appoint a new legatine commission, not now rapacious cardinals and New Legatine Commission.  
Mar. 10, 1169. avowed partisans of Henry. The Nuncios were Gratian, a hard and severe canon lawyer, not likely to swerve from the loftiest claims of the Decretals; and Vivian, a man of more pliant character, but as far as he was firm in any principle, disposed to high ecclesiastical views. At the same time he urged Becket to issue no sentences against the King or the King's followers; or if, as he hardly believed, he had already done so, to suspend their powers.

The terrors of the excommunication were not without their effect in England. Some of the Bishops began gradually to recede from the King's party, and to incline to that of the Primate. Hereford had already attempted to cross the sea. Henry of

<sup>m</sup> "Et quod omnes Romanos datâ pecunia inducant ut faciant fidelitatem domino Papæ, dummodo in nostrâ delectione regis Angliae satisfaciat voluntati,"—Epist. ad Humbold. Card.

Giles, iii. 123. Bouquet, 350. Compare Lambeth. on the effect of Italian affairs on the conduct of the Pope.—p. 106.

<sup>n</sup> Epist. 188, p. 266.

Winchester was in private correspondence with Becket: he had throughout secretly supplied him with money.<sup>a</sup> Becket skilfully laboured to awaken his old spirit of opposition to the Crown. He reminded Winchester of his royal descent, that he was secure in his powerful connexions; “the impious one would not dare to strike him for fear lest his kindred should avenge his cause.”<sup>b</sup> Norwich, Worcester, Chester, even Chichester, more than wavered. This movement was strengthened by a false step of Foliot, which exposed all his former proceedings to the charge of irregular ambition. He began to declare publicly not only that he never swore canonical obedience to Becket, but to assert the independence of the see of London and the right of the see of London to the primacy of England. Becket speaks of this as an act of spiritual parricide: Foliot was another Absalom.<sup>c</sup> He appealed to the pride and the fears of the Chapter of Canterbury: he exposed, and called on them to resist, these machinations of Foliot to degrade the archiepiscopal see. At the same time he warned all persons to abstain from communion with those who were under his ban; “for he had accurate information as to all who were guilty of that offence.” Even in France this proceeding strengthened the sympathy with Becket. The Archbishop of Sens, the Bishops of Troyes, Paris, Noyon, Auxerre, Boulogne, wrote to the Pope to denounce this audacious impiety of the Bishop of London.

The first interview of the new Papal legates, Gratian and Vivian, with the King, is described with singular minuteness by a friend of Becket.<sup>d</sup> On the eve of

<sup>a</sup> Fitz-Stephen, p. 271.

Bouquet, 358.

<sup>b</sup> “A domo vestra flagellum suspendet impius, ne quod promeruit, propinquorum vestrorum ministerio veniat super eum.”—Giles, iii. 338.

<sup>c</sup> Giles, iii. 201. Bouquet, 361.

<sup>d</sup> “Amici ad Thomam.”—Giles, iv. 277. Bouquet, 370.

St. Bartholomew's Day they arrived at Dampourt. On their approach, Geoffry Ridel and Nigel Sackville stole out of the town. The King, as he came in from hunting, courteously stopped at the lodging of the Legates: as they were conversing, the Prince rode up with a great blowing of horns from the chase, and presented a whole stag to the Legates. The next morning the King visited them, accompanied by the Bishops of Seez and of Rennes. Presently John of Oxford, Reginald of Salisbury, and the Archdeacon of Llandaff were admitted. The conference lasted the whole day, sometimes in amity, sometimes in strife. Just before sunset the King rushed out in wrath, swearing by the eyes of God that he would not submit to their terms. Gratian firmly replied, "Think not to threaten us; we come from a court which is accustomed to command Emperors and Kings." The King then summoned his barons to witness, together with his chaplains, what fair offers he had made. He departed somewhat pacified. The eighth day was appointed for the convention, at which the King and the Archbishop were again to meet in the presence of the Legates.

It was held at Bayeux. With the King appeared the Archbishops of Rouen and Bordeaux, the Bishop of Le Mans, and all the Norman prelates. The second day arrived one English bishop—Worcester. John of Poitiers kept prudently away. The Legates presented the Pope's preceding letters in favour of Becket. The King, after stating his grievances,<sup>\*</sup> said, "If for this man I do anything, on account of the Pope's entreaties, he ought to be very grateful." The

<sup>\*</sup> Henry, it should be observed, waived all the demands which he had hitherto urged against Becket, for debts incurred during his chancellorship.

Interview  
of the new  
Legates with  
the King.  
Aug. 23.

Aug. 31.

next day at a place called Le Bar, the King requested the Legates to absolve his chaplains without any oath : on their refusal, the King mounted his horse, and swore that he would never listen to the Pope or any one else concerning the restoration of Becket. The prelates interceded ; the Legates partially gave way. The King dismounted and renewed the conference. At length he consented to the return of Becket and all the exiles. He seemed delighted at this, and treated of other affairs. He returned again to the Legates, and demanded that they, or one of them, or at least some one commissioned by them, should cross over to England to absolve all who had been excommunicated by the Primate. Gratian refused this with inflexible obstinacy. The King was again furious : “ I care not an egg for you and your excommunications.” He again mounted his horse, but at the earnest supplication of the prelates he returned once more. He demanded that they should write to the Pope to announce his pacific offers. The bishops explained to the King that the Legates had at last produced a positive mandate of the Pope, enjoining their absolute obedience to his Legates. The King replied, “ I know that they will lay my realm under an interdict, but cannot I, who can take the strongest castle in a day, seize any ecclesiastic who shall presume to utter such an interdict ? ” Some concessions allayed his wrath, and he returned to his offers of reconciliation. Geoffry Ridel and Nigel Sackville were absolved on the condition of declaring, with their hands on the Gospels, that they would obey the commands of the Legates. The King still pressing the visit of one of the Legates to England, Vivian consented to take the journey. The bishops were ordered to draw up the treaty ; but the King insisted on a clause, “ Saving the honour of his Crown.” They

adjourned to a future day at Caen. The Bishop of Lisieux, adds the writer, flattered the King; the Archbishop of Rouen was for God and the Pope.

Two conferences at Caen and at Rouen were equally inconclusive; the King insisted on the words, "saving the dignity of my Crown." Becket inquired if he might add, "saving the liberty of the Church."<sup>t</sup>

The King threw all the blame of the final rupture on the Legates, who had agreed, he said, to this clause,<sup>u</sup> but through Becket's influence withdrew from their word.<sup>x</sup> He reminded the Pope that he had in his possession letters of his Holiness exempting him and his realm from all authority of the Primate till he should be received into the royal favour.<sup>y</sup> "If," he adds, "the Pope refuses my demands, he must henceforth despair of my good will, and look to other quarters to protect his realm and his honour." Both parties renewed their appeals, their intrigues in Rome: Becket's complaints of Rome's venality became louder.<sup>z</sup>

Becket began again to fulminate his excommunications. Before his departure Gratian signified to Geoffrey Ridel and Nigel Sackville that their absolution was conditional; if peace was not ratified by Michaelmas,

<sup>\* Epist. Giles, iv. 216. Bouquet, 373.</sup>

<sup>"Revocato consensu," writes the Bishop of Nevers, a moderate prelate, who regrets the obstinacy of the nuncios.—Giles, vi. 266. Bouquet, 377. Compare the letter of the clergy of Normandy to the Pope.—Giles, vi. 177. Bouquet, 377.</sup>

<sup>Becket thought, or pretended to think, that under the "dignitatibus" lurked the "consuetudinibus."—Giles, vi. 299. Bouquet, 379.</sup>

<sup>*¶ Literas vestras recepimus, et ipsas adhuc penes nos habemus, in quibus terram nostram et personas regum a prefati Cantuarensis potestate eximebatis, donec ipse in gratiam nostram rediisset.*" — Epist. Giles, vi. 291. Bouquet, 374.</sup>

<sup>*Nam quod mundus sentit, dolet, ingemiscit, nullus adeo iniquam causam ad ecclesiam Romanam defert, quin ibi spe lucri concepta ne dixerim odore sordium, adjutorem inveniat et patronum.*" — Epist. iii. 133; Bouquet, 382.</sup>

they were still under the ban. Becket menaced some old, some new victims, the Dean of Salisbury, John Cummin, the Archdeacon of Llandaff, and others.<sup>a</sup> But he now took a more decisive and terrible step. He wrote to the bishops of England,<sup>b</sup> commanding them to lay the whole kingdom under interdict; all divine offices were to cease except baptism, penance, and the viaticum,

*Nov. 2, 1170.* unless before the Feast of the Purification the

King should have given full satisfaction for his contumacy to the Church. This was to be done with closed doors, the laity expelled from the ceremony, with no bell tolling, no dirge wailing; all church music was to cease. The act was specially announced to the chapters of Chichester, Lincoln, and Bath. Of the Pope he demanded that he would treat the King's ambassadors, Reginald of Salisbury and Richard Barre, one as actually excommunicate, the other as contaminated by intercourse with the excommunicate.<sup>c</sup>

The menace of the Interdict, with the fear that the Bishops of England, all but London and Salisbury, might be overawed into publishing it in their dioceses, threw Henry back into his usual irresolution. There were other alarming signs. Gratian had returned to Rome, accompanied by William, Archbishop of Sens, Becket's most faithful admirer. Rumours spread that William was to return invested in full legatine powers—William, not only Becket's friend, but the head of the

<sup>a</sup> Giles, iii. 250; Bouquet, 387.

<sup>b</sup> Giles, iii. 334; Bouquet, 388.

<sup>c</sup> Giles, iii. 42; Bouquet, 390. Reginald of Salisbury was an especial object of Becket's hate. He calls him one born in fornication ("fornicarium"), son of a priest. Reginald hated Becket with equal cordiality.

Becket had betrayed him by a false promise of not injuring his father. "Quod utique ipsi non plus quam cani faceremus."—This letter contains Reginald's speech about Henry having the College of Cardinals in his pay.—Giles, iii. 225; Bouquet, 391.

French hierarchy. If the Interdict should be extended to Henry's French dominions, and the Excommunication launched against his person, could he depend on the precarious fidelity of the Norman prelates? Differences had again risen with the King of France.<sup>d</sup>

Henry at  
Paris.

Henry was seized with an access of devotion. He asked permission to offer his prayers at the shrines and at the Martyrs' Mount (Montmartre) at Paris. The pilgrimage would lead to an interview with the King of France, and offer an occasion of renewing the negotiations with Becket. Vivian was hastily summoned to turn back. His vanity was flattered by the hope of achieving that reconciliation which had failed with Gratian. He wrote to Becket requesting his presence. Becket, though he suspected Vivian, yet out of respect to the King of France, consented to approach as near as Château Corbeil. After the conference with the King of France, two petitions from Becket, in his usual tone of imperious humility, were presented to the King of England. The Primate condescended to entreat the favour of Henry, and the restoration of the church of Canterbury, in as ample a form as it was held before his exile. The second was more brief, but raised a new question of compensation for loss and damage during the archbishop's absence from his see.\* Both parties mistrusted each

<sup>d</sup> Becket writes to the Pope, January, 1170. "Nec vos oportet de cætero vereri, ne transeat ad schismaticos, quod sic eum Christus in manu famuli sui, regis Francorum subegit, ut ab obsequio ejus non possit amplius separari."—p. 48.

\* Many difficult points arose. Did Becket demand not merely the actual

possessions of the see, but all to which he laid claim? There were three estates held by William de Ros, Henry of Essex, and John the Marshall (the original object of dispute at Northampton?), which Becket specifically required, and declared that he would not give up if exiled for ever.—Epist. Giles, iii. 220; Bouquet, 400.

other; each watched the other's words with captious jealousy. Vivian, weary of those verbal chicaneries of the King, declared that he had never met with so mendacious a man in his life.<sup>f</sup> Vivian might have remembered his own retractations, still more those of Becket on former occasions. He withdrew from the negotiation; and this conduct, with the refusal of a gift from Henry (a rare act of virtue), won him the approbation of Becket. But Becket himself was not yet without mistrust; he had doubts whether Vivian's report to the Pope would be in the same spirit. "If it be not, he deserves the doom of the traitor Judas."

Henry at length agreed that on the question of compensation he would abide by the sentence of the court of the French King, the judgement of the Gallican Church, and of the University of Paris.<sup>g</sup> This made so favourable an impression that Becket could only evade it by declaring that he had rather come to an amicable agreement with the King than involve the affair in litigation.

At length all difficulties seemed yielding away, when Becket demanded the customary kiss of peace,  
Kiss of peace. as the pledge of reconciliation. Henry peremptorily refused; he had sworn in his wrath never to grant this favour to Becket. He was inexorable; and without this guarantee Becket would not trust the faith of the King. He was reminded, he said, by the case of the Count of Flanders, that even the kiss of peace did not secure a revolted subject, Robert de Silian, who, even after this sign of amity, had been seized and cast into a dungeon. Henry's conduct, if not the effect of sudden passion or ungovernable aversion, is inexplicable.

Why did he seek this interview, which, if he was insincere in his desire for reconciliation, could afford but short delay? and from such oaths he would hardly have refused, for any great purpose of his own, to receive absolution.<sup>h</sup> On the other hand, it is quite clear that Becket reckoned on the legatine power of William of Sens and the terror of the English prelates, who had refused to attend a council in London to reject the Interdict. He had now full confidence that he could exact his own terms and humble the King under his feet.<sup>i</sup>

But the King was resolved to wage war to the utmost. Geoffry Ridel, Archdeacon of Canterbury, was sent to England with a royal proclamation containing the following articles:—I. Whosoever shall bring into the realm any letter from the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury is guilty of high treason. II. Whosoever, whether bishop, clerk, or layman, shall observe the Interdict, shall be ejected from all his chattels, which are confiscate to the Crown. III. All clerks absent from England shall return before the feast of St. Hilary, on pain of forfeiture of all their revenues. IV. No appeal is to be made to the Pope or Archbishop of Canterbury under pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of all chattels. V. All laymen from beyond seas are to be searched, and if anything be found upon them contrary to the King's honour, they are to be imprisoned; the same with those who cross to the Continent. VI. If any clerk or monk shall land in England without passport from the King, or with anything contrary to his honour, he shall be thrown into prison. VII. No clerk or monk may cross the seas without the King's

<sup>h</sup> According to Pope Alexander, | iv. 55.

Henry offered that his son should give |  
the kiss of peace in his stead.—Giles, |  
See his letter to his emissaries at  
Rome.—Giles, iii. 219; Bouquet, 401.

passport. The same rule applied to the clergy of Wales, who were to be expelled from all schools in England. Lastly, VIII. The sheriffs were to administer an oath to all freemen throughout England, in open court, that they would obey these royal mandates, thus abjuring, it is said, all obedience to Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>k</sup> The bishops, however, declined the oath; some concealed themselves in their dioceses. Becket addressed a triumphant or gratulatory letter to his suffragans on their firmness. "We are now one, except that most hapless Judas, that rotten limb (Foliot of London), which is severed from us."<sup>m</sup> Another letter is addressed to the people of England, remonstrating on their impious abjuration of their pastor, and offering absolution to all who had sworn through compulsion and repented of their oath.<sup>n</sup> The King and the Primate thus contested the realm of England.

But the Pope was not yet to be inflamed by Becket's <sup>The Pope still dubious.</sup> passions, nor quite disposed to depart from his temporising policy. John of Oxford was at the court in Benevento with the Archdeacons of Rouen and Seez. From that court returned the Archdeacon of Llandaff and Robert de Barre with a commission to the Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers to make one more effort for the termination of the difficulties. On the one hand they were armed with powers, if the King did not accede to his own terms within forty days after his citation (he had offered a thousand marks as compensation for all losses), to pronounce an inter-

<sup>k</sup> Ricardus Dorubernensis apud Twysden. Lord Lyttelton has another copy in his appendix; in that a ninth article forbade the payment of Peter's Pence to Rome; it was to be collected

and brought into the exchequer.

<sup>m</sup> Epist. Giles, iii. 195; Bouquet, 404.

<sup>n</sup> Giles, iii. 192; Bouquet, 405.

dict against his continental dominions; on the other, Becket was exhorted to humble himself before the King; if Henry was inflexible and declined the Pope's offered absolution from his oath, to accept the kiss of peace from the King's son. The King was urged to abolish in due time the impious and obnoxious Customs. And to these prelates was likewise entrusted authority to absolve the refractory Bishops of London and Salisbury.<sup>o</sup> This, however, was not the only object of Henry's new embassy to the Pope. He had long determined on the coronation of his eldest son; it had been delayed for various reasons. He seized this opportunity of reviving a design which would be as well humiliating to Becket as also of great moment in case the person of the King should be struck by the thunder of excommunication. The coronation of the King of England was the undoubted prerogative of the Archbishops of Canterbury, which had never been invaded without sufficient cause, and Becket was the last man tamely to surrender so important a right of his see. John of Oxford was to exert every means (what those means were may be conjectured rather than proved) to obtain the papal permission for the Archbishop of York to officiate at that august ceremony.

The absolution of the Bishops of London and Salisbury was an astounding blow to Becket. He tried to impede it by calling in question the power of the archbishop to pronounce it without the presence of his colleague. The archbishop disregarded his remonstrance, and Becket's sentence was thus annulled by the authority of the Pope. Rumours at the same time began to spread that the Pope had granted to the Archbishop

of York power to proceed to the coronation. Becket's fury burst all bounds. He wrote to the Cardinal Albert and to Gratian: "In the court of Rome, now as ever, Christ is crucified and Barabbas released. The miserable and blameless exiles are condemned, the sacrilegious, the homicides, the impenitent thieves are absolved, those whom Peter himself declares that in his own chair (the world protesting against it) he would have no power to absolve.<sup>p</sup> Henceforth I commit my cause to God—God alone can find a remedy. Let those appeal to Rome who triumph over the innocent and the godly, and return glorying in the ruin of the Church. For me I am ready to die." Becket's fellow exiles addressed the Cardinal Albert, denouncing in vehement language the avarice of the court of Rome, by which they were brought to support the robbers of the Church. It is no longer King Henry alone who is guilty of this six years' persecution, but the Church of Rome.<sup>q</sup>

The coronation of the Prince by the Archbishop of York took place in the Abbey of Westminster on the 15th of June.<sup>r</sup> The assent of the clergy was given with that of the laity. The Archbishop of York produced a

<sup>p</sup> Epist. Giles, iii. 96; Bouquet, 416; Giles iii. 108; Bouquet, 419. "Sed pro eâ mori parati sumus." He adds: "Insurgant qui voluerint cardinales, arment non modo regem Angliæ, sed totum, si possent orbem in perniciem nostram . . . Utinam via Romana non gratis peremisset tot miseros innocentes. Quis de cetero audebit illi regi resistere quem ecclesia Romana tot triumphis animavit, et armavit exemplo pernitoso manante ad posteros."

<sup>q</sup> "Nec persuadebitur mundo, quod

suasores isti Deum saperent: sed potius pecuniam, quam immoderato avaritiae ardore sitiunt, olfecerunt."—Giles, iv. 291; Bouquet, 417.

<sup>r</sup> Becket's depression at this event is dwelt upon in a letter of Peter of Blois to John of Salisbury. Peter travelled from Rome to Bologna with the Papal legates. From them he gathered that either Becket would soon be reconciled to the King or be removed to another patriarchate.—Epist. xxii. apud Giles, i. p. 84.

papal brief, authorising him to perform the ceremony.<sup>s</sup> An inhibitory letter, if it reached England, only came into the King's hand and was suppressed; no one, in fact (as the production of such papal letter, as well as Becket's protest to the archbishop and to the bishops collectively and severally, was by the royal proclamation high treason or at least a misdemeanour) would dare to produce them.

The estrangement seemed now complete, the reconciliation more remote than ever. The Archbishop of Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers, though urged to immediate action by Becket and even by the Pope, admitted delay after delay, first for the voyage of the King to England, and secondly for his return to Normandy. Becket seemed more and more desperate, the King more and more resolute. Even after the coronation, it should seem, Becket wrote to Roger of York,<sup>t</sup> to Henry of Worcester, and even to Foliot of London, to publish the Interdict in their dioceses. The latter was a virtual acknowledgement of the legality of his absolution, which in a long letter to the Bishop of Nevers

\* Dr. Lingard holds this letter, printed by Lord Lyttelton, and which he admits was produced, to have been a forgery. If it was, it was a most audacious one, and a most flagrant insult to the Pope, whom Henry was even now endeavouring to propitiate through the Lombard Republics and the Emperor of the East (see Giles, iv. 10). It is remarkable, too, that though the Pope declares that this coronation, contrary to his prohibition (Giles, iv. 80), is not to be taken as a precedent, he has no word of the forgery. Nor do I find any contemporary assertion of its spuriousness.

Becket, indeed, in his account of the last interview with the King, only mentions the general permission granted by the Pope at an early period of the reign; and argues as if this were the only permission. Is it possible that a special permission to York to act was craftily interpolated into the general permission? But the trick may have been on the side of the Pope, now granting, now nullifying his own grants by inhibition. Bouquet is strong against Baronius (as on other points) upon Alexander's duplicity.—p. 434.

<sup>t</sup> Giles, iii. 229.

he had contested :<sup>u</sup> but the Interdict still hung over the King and the realm ; the fidelity of the clergy was precarious.

The reconciliation at last was so sudden as to take the world by surprise. The clue to this is found in Fitz-Stephen. Some one had suggested by word or by writing to the King that the Primate would be less dangerous within than without the realm.<sup>x</sup> The hint flashed conviction on the King's mind. The two Kings had appointed an interview at Fretteville, between Chartres and Tours. The Archbishop of Sens Treaty of Fretteville. prevailed on Becket to be, unsummoned, in the neighbourhood. Some days after the King seemed persuaded by the Archbishops of Sens and Rouen and the Bishop of Nevers to hold a conference with Becket.<sup>y</sup> As soon as they drew near the King rode up, uncovered his head, and saluted the Prelate with frank courtesy, and after a short conversation between the two and the Archbishop of Sens, the King withdrew apart with Becket. Their conference was so long as to try the patience of the spectators, so familiar that it might seem there had never been discord between them. Becket took a moderate tone ; by his own account he laid the faults of the King entirely on his evil counsellors. After a gentle admonition to the King on his sins, he urged him to make restitution to the see of Canterbury. He dwelt strongly on the late usurpation on the rights of the primacy, on the coronation of the King's son. Henry alleged the state of the kingdom and the necessity of the measure ; he promised that as his son's queen,

<sup>u</sup> Giles, iii. 302.

<sup>x</sup> " Dictum fuit aliquem dixisse vel  
scripsisse regi Anglorum de Arche-  
piscopo ut quid tenetur exclusus ? me-

lius tenebitur inclusus quam exclusus.  
Satisque dictum fuit intelligenti."—  
p. 272.

<sup>y</sup> Giles, iv. 50 ; Bouquet, 436.

the daughter of the King of France, was also to be crowned, that ceremony should be performed by Becket, and that his son should again receive his crown from the hands of the Primate.

At the close of the interview Becket sprung from his horse and threw himself at the King's feet. The King leaped down, and holding his stirrup compelled the Primate to mount his horse again. In the most friendly terms he expressed his full reconciliation not only to Becket himself, but to the wondering and delighted multitude. There seemed an understanding on both sides to suppress all points which might lead to disagreement. The King did not dare (so Becket writes triumphantly to the Pope) to mutter one word about the Customs.<sup>z</sup> Becket was equally prudent, though he took care that his submission should be so vaguely worded as to be drawn into no dangerous concession on his part. He abstained, too, from all other perilous topics ; he left undecided the amount of satisfaction to the church of Canterbury ; and on these general terms he and the partners of his exile were formally received into the King's grace.

July.

If the King was humiliated by this quiet and sudden reconciliation with the imperious prelate, to outward appearance at least he concealed his humiliation by his noble and kingly manner. If he submitted to the spiritual reproof of the prelate, he condescended to receive into his favour his refractory subject. Each maintained prudent silence on all points in dispute. Henry received, but he also granted pardon. If his

---

<sup>z</sup> “Nam de consuetudinibus quas constantia pervicacia vindicare consueverat nec mutare præsumpsit.” Becket was as mute. The issue of the quarrel seems entirely changed. The Constitutions of Clarendon recede, the right of coronation occupies the chief place.—See the long letter, Giles, 65.

concession was really extorted by fear, not from policy, compassion for Becket's six years' exile might seem not without influence. If Henry did not allude to the Customs, he did not annul them; they were still the law of the land. The kiss of peace was eluded by a vague promise. Becket made a merit of not driving the King to perjury, but he skilfully avoided this trying test of the King's sincerity.

But Becket's revenge must be satisfied with other <sup>Becket's schemes of vengeance.</sup> victims. If the worldly King could forget the rancour of this long animosity, it was not so easily appeased in the breast of the Christian Prelate. No doubt vengeance disguised itself to Becket's mind as the lofty and rightful assertion of spiritual authority. The opposing prelates must be at his feet, even under his feet. The first thought of his partisans was not his return to England with a generous amnesty of all wrongs, or a gentle reconciliation of the whole clergy, but the condign punishment of those who had so long been the counsellors of the King, and had so recently officiated in the coronation of his son.

The court of Rome did not refuse to enter into these views, to visit the offence of those disloyal bishops who had betrayed the interests and compromised the high principles of churchmen.<sup>a</sup> It was presumed that the King would not risk a peace so hardly gained for his obsequious prelates. The lay adherents of the King, even the plunderers of Church property were spared,

<sup>Dated Sept. 10.</sup> some ecclesiastics about his person, John of Oxford himself, escaped censure; but Pope Alexander sent the decree of suspension against the

---

<sup>a</sup> Humbold Bishop of Ostia advised the confining the triumph to the de-pression of the Archbishop of York and the excommunication of the Bishops.—Giles, vi. 128; Bouquet, 443.

Archbishop of York, and renewed the excommunication of London and Salisbury, with whom were joined the Archdeacon of Canterbury and the Bishop of Rochester, as guilty of special violation of their allegiance to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of St. Asaph, and some others. Becket himself saw the policy of altogether separating the cause of the bishops from that of the King. He requested that some expressions relating to the King's excesses, and condemnatory of the bishops for swearing to the Customs should be suppressed ; and the excommunication grounded entirely on their usurpation of the right of crowning the King.<sup>b</sup>

About four months elapsed between the treaty of Fretteville and the return of Becket to England. They were occupied by these negotiations at Rome, Veroli, and Ferentino ; by discussions with the King, who was attacked during this period with a dangerous illness ; and by the mission of some of Becket's officers to resume the estates of the see. Becket had two personal interviews with the King ; the first was at Tours, <sup>Interview at Tours.</sup> where, as he was now in the King's dominions, he endeavoured to obtain the kiss of peace. The Archbishop hoped to betray Henry into this favour during the celebration of the mass, in which it might seem only a part of the service.<sup>c</sup> Henry was on his guard, and ordered the mass for the dead, in which the benediction is not pronounced. The King had received Becket fairly ; they parted not without ill-concealed estrangement. At the second meeting the King seemed more friendly ; he went so far as to say, "Why resist my wishes ? I would place everything in your hands."

---

<sup>b</sup> " *Licet ei (regi sc.) peperceritis, curiosus revelatione of the arrogance and dissimilare non audetis excessus et subtlety of Becket.—Giles, iii. 77. crima sacerdotum.*" This letter is a <sup>c</sup> It is called the Pax.

Becket, in his own words, bethought him of the tempter, “All these things will I give unto thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.”

The King had written to his son in England that the see of Canterbury should be restored to Becket, as it was three months before his exile. But there were two strong parties hostile to Becket: the King’s officers who held in sequestration the estates of the see, and seem to have especially coveted the receipt of the Michaelmas rents; and with these some of the fierce warrior nobles, who held lands or castles which were claimed as possessions of the Church of Canterbury. Randolph de Broc, his old inveterate enemy, was determined not to surrender his castle of Saltwood. It was reported to Becket, by Becket represented to the King, that De Broc had sworn that he would have Becket’s life before he had eaten a loaf of bread in England. The castle of Rochester was held on the same doubtful title by one of his enemies. The second party was that of the bishops, which was powerful, with a considerable body both of the clergy and laity. They had sufficient influence to urge the King’s officers to take the strongest measures, lest the Papal letters of excommunication should be introduced into the kingdom.

It is, perhaps, vain to conjecture, how far, if Becket had returned to England in the spirit of meekness, forgiveness, and forbearance, not wielding the thunders of excommunication, nor determined to trample on his adversaries, and to exact the utmost even of his most doubtful rights, he might have resumed his see, and gradually won back the favour of the King, the respect and love of the whole hierarchy, and all the legitimate possessions of his church. But he came not in peace,

nor was he received in peace.<sup>d</sup> It was not the Archbishop of Rouen, as he had hoped, but his old enemy John of Oxford, who was commanded by the King to accompany him, and reinstate him in his see. The King might allege that one so much in the royal confidence was the best protector of the Archbishop. The money which had been promised for his voyage was not paid; he was forced to borrow 300*l.* of the Archbishop of Rouen. He went, as he felt, or affected to feel, with death before his eyes, yet nothing should now separate him from his long-divided flock. Before his embarkation at Whitsand in Flanders, he received intelligence that the shores were watched by his enemies, it was said with designs on his life,<sup>e</sup> but assuredly with the determination of making a rigid search for the letters of excommunication.<sup>f</sup> To secure the safe carriage of one of these perilous documents, the suspension of the Archbishop of York, it was entrusted to a nun named Idonea, whom he exhorts, like another Judith, to this holy act, and promises her as her reward the remission of her sins.<sup>g</sup> Other contraband letters were conveyed across the Channel by unknown hands, and were delivered to the bishops before Becket's landing.

Letters of  
excommuni-  
cation sent  
before him.

<sup>d</sup> Becket disclaims vengeance: "Neque hoc dicimus, Deo teste, vindictam expetentes, quum scriptum esse noverimus, non quæres ultionem . . . sed ut ecclesia correctionis exemplo possit per Dei gratiam in posterum roborare, et poenam paucorum multos edificare."—Giles, iii. 76.

\* See Becket's account.—Giles, iii. p. 81.

<sup>e</sup> Lambeth says: "Visum est autem acnullis, quod incircumspectè lite-

rarum vindictâ post pacem usus est, que tantum pacis desperationes fuerint data."—P. 116. Compare pp. 119 and 152.

<sup>g</sup> Lord Lyttelton has drawn an inference from these words unfavourable to the purity of Idonea's former life; and certainly the examples of the Magdalene and the woman of Egypt, if this be not the case, were unhappily chosen.

The Prelates of York and London were at Canterbury when they received these Papal letters. When the fulminating instruments were read before them, in which was this passage, "we will fill your faces with ignominy," their countenances fell. They sent messengers to complain to Becket, that he came not in peace, but in fire and flame, trampling his brother bishops under his feet, and making their necks his footstool: that he had condemned them uncited, unheard, unjudged. "There is no peace," Becket sternly replied, "but to men of good will."<sup>h</sup> It was said that London was disposed to humble himself before Becket; but York,<sup>i</sup> trusting in his wealth, boasted that he had in his power the Pope, the King, and all their courts.

Instead of the port of Dover, where he was expected, Lands at Sandwich. Dec. 1. Becket's vessel, with the archiepiscopal banner displayed, cast anchor at Sandwich. Soon after his landing, appeared in arms the Sheriff of Kent, Randolph de Broc, and others of his enemies. They searched his baggage, fiercely demanded that he should absolve the bishops, and endeavoured to force the Archdeacon of Sens, a foreign ecclesiastic, to take an oath to keep the peace of the realm. John of Oxford was shocked, and repressed their violence. On his way to Canterbury the country clergy came forth with their flocks to meet him; they strewed their garments in his way, chanting, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name At Canterbury. of the Lord." Arrived at Canterbury, he rode at once to the church with a vast procession of clergy, amid the ringing of bells and the chanting of music. He took his archiepiscopal throne, and after-

<sup>h</sup> Fitz-Stephen, pp. 281, 284.

<sup>i</sup> Becket calls York his ancient enemy: "Lucifer ponens sedem suam in aquilone."

wards preached on the text, “Here we have no abiding city.” The next morning came again the Sheriff of Kent, with Randolph de Broc, and the messengers of the bishops, demanding their absolution.<sup>k</sup> Becket evaded the question by asserting that the Excommunication was not pronounced by him, but by his superior the Pope; that he had no power to abrogate the sentence. This declaration was directly at issue with the bull of excommunication: if the bishops gave satisfaction to the Archbishop, he had power to act on behalf of the Pope.<sup>m</sup> But to the satisfaction which, according to one account, he did demand, that they should stand a public trial, in other words place themselves at his mercy, they would not, and hardly could submit. They set out immediately to the King in Normandy.

The restless Primate was determined to keep alive the popular fervour, enthusiastically, almost fanatically, on his side. On a pretext of a visit to the young King at Woodstock, to offer him the present Goes to London. of three beautiful horses, he set forth on a stately progress. Wherever he went he was received with acclamations and prayers for his blessing by the clergy and the people. In Rochester he was entertained by the Bishop with great ceremony. In London there was the same excitement: he was received in the palace of the Bishop of Winchester in Southwark. Even there he scattered some excommunications.<sup>n</sup> The Court took

\* Becket accuses the bishops of thirsting for his blood! “Let them drink it!” But this was a phrase which he uses on all occasions, even to William of Pavia.

\*\* “Si vero ita eidem Archiepiscopo et Cantuarensi Ecclesiae satisfacere inteniretis, ut penam istam ipse videat

relaxandam, vice nostrâ per illum volumus adimpleri.”—Apud Bouquet, p. 461.

\*\* “Ipse tamen Londonias adiens, et ibi missarum solemniis celebratis, quosdam excommunicavit.”—Passio. iii. p. 154.

alarm, and sent orders to the prelate to return to his diocese. Becket obeyed, but alleged as the cause of his obedience, not the royal command, but his own desire to celebrate the festival of Christmas in his metropolitan church. The week passed in holding sittings in his court, where he acted with his usual promptitude, vigour, and resolution against the intruders into livings, and upon the encroachments on his estates; and in devotions most fervent, mortifications most austere.<sup>o</sup>

His rude enemies committed in the mean time all kinds of petty annoyances, which he had not the loftiness to disdain. Randolph de Broc seized a vessel laden with rich wine for his use, and imprisoned the sailors in Pevensey Castle. An order from the court compelled him to release ship and crew. They robbed the people who carried his provisions, broke into his park, hunted his deer, beat his retainers; and, at the instigation of Randolph's brother, Robert de Broc, a ruffian, a renegade monk, cut off the tail of one of his state horses.

On Christmas day Becket preached on the appropriate text, "Peace on earth, good will towards men." The sermon agreed ill with the text. He spoke of one of his predecessors, St. Alphege, who had suffered martyrdom. "There may soon be a second." He then burst out into a fierce, impetuous, terrible tone, arraigned the courtiers, and closed with a fulminating excommunication against Nigel de Sackville, who had refused to give up a benefice into which, in Becket's judgement, he had

<sup>o</sup> Since this passage was written an excellent and elaborate paper has appeared in the Quarterly Review, full of local knowledge. I recognise the hand of a friend from whom great things may be expected. I find, I

think, nothing in which we disagree, though that account, having more ample space, is more particular than mine. (Reprinted in 'Memorials of Canterbury,' by Rev. A. P. Stanley.)

intruded, and against Randolph and Robert de Broc. The maimed horse was not forgotten. He renewed in the most vehement language the censure on the bishops, dashed the candle on the pavement in token of their utter extinction, and then proceeded to the mass at the altar.<sup>p</sup>

In the mean time the excommunicated prelates had sought the King in the neighbourhood of Bayeux; they implored his protection for <sup>The bishops with the King.</sup> themselves and the clergy of the realm. "If all are to be visited by spiritual censures," said the King, "who officiated at the coronation of my son, by the eyes of God, I am equally guilty." The whole conduct of Becket since his return was detailed, and no doubt deeply darkened by the hostility of his adversaries. All had been done with an insolent and seditious design of alienating the affections of the people from the King. Henry demanded counsel of the prelates; they declared themselves unable to give it. But one incautiously said, "So long as Thomas lives, you will never be at peace." The King broke out into one of his terrible constitutional fits of passion; and at length let fall the fatal words, "Have I none of my thankless and cowardly courtiers who will relieve me from the insults of one low-born and turbulent priest?"

These words were not likely to fall unheard on the ears of fierce and warlike men, reckless of <sup>The King's fatal words.</sup> bloodshed, possessed with a strong sense of their feudal allegiance, and eager to secure to themselves the reward of desperate service. Four knights, chamberlains of the King, Reginald Fitz-Urse, William de Tracy, Hugh de Moreville, and Reginald Brito, dis

---

<sup>p</sup> Fitz-Stephen, De Bosham, Grim. in loc.

appeared from the court.<sup>4</sup> On the morrow, when a grave council was held, some barons are said, even there, to have advised the death of Becket. Milder measures were adopted : the Earl of Mandeville was sent off with orders to arrest the primate ; and as the disappearance of these four knights could not be unmarked, to stop them in the course of any unauthorised enterprise.

But murder travels faster than justice or mercy. They were almost already on the shores of England. It is said that they met in Saltwood Castle. On the 28th of December, having, by the aid of Randolph de Broc, collected some troops in the streets of Canterbury, they took up their quarters with Clarendon, Abbot of St. Augustine's.

The assassination of Becket has something appalling, with all its terrible circumstances seen in the remote past. What was it in its own age ? The most distinguished churchman in Christendom, the champion of the great sacerdotal order, almost in the hour of his triumph over the most powerful king in Europe ; a man, besides the awful sanctity inherent in the person of every ecclesiastic, of most saintly holiness ; soon after the most solemn festival of the Church, in his own cathedral, not only sacrilegiously, but cruelly murdered, with every mark of hatred and insult. Becket had all the dauntlessness, none of the meekness of the martyr ; but while his dauntlessness would command boundless admiration, few, if any, would seek the more genuine sign of Christian martyrdom.

The four knights do not seem to have deliberately determined on their proceedings, or to have resolved,

---

<sup>4</sup> See, on the former history of these knights, Quarterly Review, vol. xciii. p. 355. The writer has industriously traced out all that can be known, much which was rumoured about these men.

except in extremity, on the murder. They entered, but unarmed, the outer chamber.<sup>1</sup> The Arch-  
bishop had just dined, and withdrawn from the hall. They were offered food, as was the usage; they declined, thirsting, says one of the biographers, for blood. The Archbishop obeyed the summons to hear a message from the King; they were admitted to his presence. As they entered, there was no salutation on either side, till the Primate having surveyed, perhaps recognised them, moved to them with cold courtesy. Fitz-Urse was the spokesman in the fierce altercation which ensued. Becket replied with haughty firmness. Fitz-Urse began by reproaching him with his ingratitude and seditious disloyalty in opposing the coronation of the King's son, and commanded him, in instant obedience to the King, to absolve the prelates. Becket protested that so far from wishing to diminish the power of the King's son, he would have given him three crowns and the most splendid realm. For the excommunicated bishops he persisted in his usual evasion that they had been suspended by the Pope, by the Pope alone could they be absolved; nor had they yet offered proper satisfaction. "It is the King's command," spake Fitz-Urse, "that you and the rest of your disloyal followers leave the kingdom."<sup>2</sup> "It becomes not the King to utter such command: henceforth no power on earth shall separate me from my flock." "You have presumed to excommunicate, without consulting the King, the King's servants and officers." "Nor will I ever spare the man who violates the canons of Rome, or the rights of the Church." "From whom do you hold your arch-

<sup>1</sup> Tuesday, Dec. 29. See, on the fatality of Tuesday in Becket's life, Q. R. p. 357.

<sup>2</sup> Grim, p. 71. Fitz-Stephen.

bishopric?" "My spirituals from God and the Pope, my temporals from the King." "Do you not hold all from the King?" "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." "You speak in peril of your life!" "Come ye to murder me? I defy you, and will meet you front to front in the battle of the Lord." He added, that some among them had sworn fealty to him. At this, it is said, they grew furious, and gnashed with their teeth. The prudent John of Salisbury heard with regret this intemperate language: "Would it may end well!" Fitz-Urse shouted aloud, "In the King's name I enjoin you all, clerks and monks, to arrest this man, till the King shall have done justice on his body." They rushed out, calling for their arms.

His friends had more fear for Becket than Becket for himself. The gates were closed and barred, but presently sounds were heard of those without, striving to break in. The lawless Randolph de Broc was hewing at the door with an axe. All around Becket was the confusion of terror: he only was calm. Again spoke John of Salisbury with his cold prudence—"Thou wilt never take counsel: they seek thy life." "I am prepared to die." "We who are sinners are not so weary of life." "God's will be done." The sounds without grew wilder. All around him entreated Becket to seek sanctuary in the church. He refused, whether from religious reluctance that the holy place should be stained with his blood, or from the nobler motive of sparing his assassins this deep aggravation of their crime. They urged that the bell was already tolling for vespers. He seemed to give a reluctant consent; but he would not move without the dignity of his crozier carried before him. With gentle compulsion they half drew, half carried him through a

private chamber, they in all the hasty agony of terror, he striving to maintain his solemn state, into <sup>Becket  
in the  
Church.</sup> the church. The din of the armed men was ringing in the cloister. The affrighted monks broke off the service; some hastened to close the doors; Becket commanded them to desist—"No one should be debarred from entering the house of God." John of Salisbury and the rest fled and hid themselves behind the altars and in other dark places. The Archbishop might have escaped into the dark and intricate crypt, or into a chapel in the roof. There remained only the Canon Robert (of Merton), Fitz-Stephen, and the faithful Edward Grim. Becket stood between the altar of St. Benedict and that of the Virgin.<sup>t</sup> It was thought that Becket contemplated taking his seat on his archiepiscopal throne near the high altar.

Through the open door of the cloister came rushing in the four, fully armed, some with axes in their hands, with two or three wild followers, through <sup>The murder.</sup> the dim and bewildering twilight. The knights shouted aloud, "Where is the traitor?" No answer came back. "Where is the Archbishop?" "Behold me, no traitor, but a priest of God!" Another fierce and rapid altercation followed: they demanded the absolution of the bishops, his own surrender to the King's justice. They strove to seize him and to drag him forth from the Church (even they had awe of the holy place), either to kill him without, or to carry him in bonds to the King. He clung to the pillar. In the struggle he grappled with De Tracy, and with desperate strength dashed him on the pavement. His passion rose; he called Fitz-Urse by a foul name, a pander. These were almost his last

<sup>t</sup> For the accurate local description, see Quarterly Review, p. 367.

words (how unlike those of Stephen and the greater than Stephen!). He taunted Fitz-Urse with his fealty sworn to himself. "I owe no fealty but to my King!" returned the maddened soldier, and struck the first blow. Edward Grim interposed his arm, which was almost severed off. The sword struck Becket, but slightly, on the head. Becket received it in an attitude of prayer—"Lord, receive my spirit," with an ejaculation to the Saints of the Church. Blow followed blow (Tracy seems to have dealt the first mortal wound), till all, unless perhaps De Moreville, had wreaked their vengeance. The last, that of Richard de Brito, smote off a piece of his skull. Hugh of Horsea, their follower, a renegade priest surnamed Mauclerk, set his heel upon his neck, and crushed out the blood and brains. "Away!" said the brutal ruffian, "it is time that we were gone." They rushed out to plunder the archiepiscopal palace.

The mangled body was left on the pavement; and when his affrighted followers ventured to approach to perform their last offices, an incident occurred which, however incongruous, is too characteristic to be suppressed. Amid their adoring awe at his courage and constancy, their profound sorrow for his loss, they broke out into a rapture of wonder and delight on discovering not merely that his whole body was swathed in the coarsest sackcloth, but that his lower garments were swarming with vermin. From that moment miracles began. Even the populace had before been divided; voices had been heard among the crowd denying him to be a martyr; he was but the victim of his own obstinacy.<sup>u</sup> The Archbishop of York even after this dared to preach that it was a judgement of

God against Becket—that “he perished, like Pharaoh, in his pride.”<sup>x</sup> But the torrent swept away at once all this resistance. The Government inhibited the miracles, but faith in miracles scorns obedience to human laws. The Passion of the Martyr Thomas was saddened and glorified every day with new incidents of its atrocity, of his holy firmness, of wonders wrought by his remains.

The horror of Becket’s murder ran throughout Christendom. At first, of course, it was attributed to Henry’s direct orders. Universal hatred branded the King of England with a kind of outlawry, a spontaneous excommunication. William of Sens, though the attached friend of Becket, probably does not exaggerate the public sentiment when he describes this deed as surpassing the cruelty of Herod, the perfidy of Julian, the sacrilege of the traitor Judas.<sup>y</sup>

It were injustice to King Henry not to suppose that with the dread as to the consequences of this act must have mingled some reminiscences of the gallant friend and companion of his youth and of the faithful minister, as well as religious horror at a cruel murder, so savagely and impiously executed.<sup>z</sup> He shut himself for three days in his chamber, obstinately refused all food and comfort, till his attendants began to fear for his life. He issued orders for the apprehension of the murderers,<sup>a</sup>

<sup>x</sup> John of Salisbury. Bouquet, 619, 620.

<sup>y</sup> Giles, iv. 162. Bouquet, 467. It was fitting that the day after that of the Holy Innocents should be that on which should rise up this new Herod.

<sup>z</sup> See the letter of Arnulf of Lisieux.—Bouquet, 469.

<sup>a</sup> The Quarterly reviewer has the

merit of tracing out the extraordinary fate of the murderers. “By a singular reciprocity, the principle for which Becket had contended, that priests should not be subjected to the secular courts, prevented the trial of a layman for the murder of a priest by any other than a clerical tribunal.” Legend imposes upon them dark and romantic

and despatched envoys to the Pope to exculpate himself from all participation or cognisance of the crime. His ambassadors found the Pope at Tusculum: they were at first sternly refused an audience. The afflicted and indignant Pope was hardly prevailed on to permit the execrated name of the King of England to be uttered before him. The cardinals still friendly to the King with difficulty obtained knowledge of Alexander's determination. It was, on a fixed day, to pronounce with the utmost solemnity, excommunication against the King by name, and an interdict on all his dominions, on the Continent as well as in England. The ambassadors hardly obtained the abandonment of this fearful purpose, by swearing that the King would submit in all things to the judgement of his Holiness. With difficulty the terms of reconciliation were arranged.

In the cathedral of Avranches in Normandy, in the presence of the Cardinals Theodin of Porto,  
Reconciliation at Avranches. and Albert the Chancellor, Legates for that especial purpose, Henry swore on the Gospels that he had neither commanded nor desired the death of Becket; that it had caused him sorrow, not joy; he had not grieved so deeply for the death of his father or his mother.<sup>b</sup> He stipulated—I. To maintain two hundred knights at his own cost in the Holy Land. II. To abrogate the Statutes of Clarendon, and all bad customs introduced during his reign.<sup>c</sup> III. That he would reinvest the Church of Canterbury in all its rights

acts of penance; history finds them in high places of trust and honour.—pp. 377, *et seqq.* I may add that John of Oxford five years after was Bishop of Norwich. Ridel too became Bishop of Ely.

<sup>b</sup> Diceto, p. 557.

<sup>c</sup> This stipulation, in Henry's view, cancelled hardly any; as few, and these but trifling customs, had been admitted during his reign.

and possessions, and pardon and restore to their estates all who had incurred his wrath in the cause of the Primate. IV. If the Pope should require it, he would himself make a crusade against the Saracens in Spain. In the porch of the church he was reconciled, but with no ignominious ceremony.

Throughout the later and the darker part of Henry's reign the clergy took care to inculcate, and the people were prone enough to believe, that all his disasters and calamities, the rebellion of his wife and of his sons, were judgements of God for the persecution if not the murder of the Martyr Thomas. The strong mind of Henry himself, depressed by misfortune and by the estrangement of his children, acknowledged with superstitious awe the justice of their conclusions. Heaven, the Martyr in Heaven, must be appeased by a public humiliating penance. The deeper the degradation the more valuable the atonement. In less than three years after his death the King visited the tomb of Becket, by this time a canonised saint, renowned not only throughout England for his wonder-working powers, but to the limits of Christendom. As soon as he came near enough to see the towers of Canterbury, the King dis-  
mounted from his horse, and for three miles walked with bare and bleeding feet along the flinty road. The tomb of the Saint was then in the crypt beneath the church. The King threw himself prostrate before it. The Bishop of London (Foliot) preached; he declared to the wondering multitude that on his solemn oath the King was entirely guiltless of the murder of the Saint: but as his hasty words had been the innocent cause of the crime, he submitted in lowly obedience to the penance of the Church. The naughty monarch then prayed to be scourged by the

Penance at  
Canterbury.  
Friday,  
July 12,

willing monks. From the one end of the church to the other each ecclesiastic present gratified his pride, and thought that he performed his duty, by giving a few stripes.<sup>d</sup> The King passed calmly through this rude discipline, and then spent a night and a day in prayers and tears, imploring the intercession in Heaven of him whom, he thought not now on how just grounds, he had pursued with relentless animosity on earth.<sup>e</sup>

Thus Becket obtained by his death that triumph for which he would perhaps have struggled in vain through a long life. He was now a Saint, and for some centuries the most popular Saint in England: among the people, from a generous indignation at his barbarous murder, from the fame of his austerities and his charities, no doubt from admiration of his bold resistance to the kingly power; among the clergy as the champion, the martyr of their order. Even if the clergy had had no interest in the miracles at the tomb of Becket, the high-strung faith of the people would have wrought them almost without suggestion or assistance. Cures would have been made or imagined; the latent powers of diseased or paralysed bodies would have been quickened into action. Belief, and the fear of disbelieving, would have multiplied one extraordinary event into a hundred; fraud would be outbid by zeal; the invention of the crafty, even if what may seem invention was not more often ignorance and credulity, would be outrun by the demands of superstition. There is no calculating the

<sup>d</sup> The scene is related by all the monkish chroniclers,—Gervaise, Diceto, Brompton, Hoveden.

\* Peter of Blois was assured by the two cardinal legates of Henry's in-

nocence of Becket's death. See this letter, which contains a most high-flown eulogy on the transcendent virtues of Henry.—Epist. 66.

extent and effects of these epidemic outbursts of passionate religion.<sup>f</sup>

Becket was indeed the martyr of the clergy, not of the Church; of sacerdotal power, not of Christianity; of a caste, not of mankind.<sup>g</sup> From the beginning to end it was a strife for the authority, the immunities, the possessions of the clergy.<sup>h</sup> The liberty of the Church was the exemption of the clergy from law; the vindication of their separate, exclusive, distinctive existence from the rest of mankind. It was a sacrifice to the deified self; not the individual self, but self as the centre and representative of a great corporation. Here and there in the long full correspondence there is some slight allusion to the miseries of the people in being deprived of the services of the exiled bishops and clergy:<sup>i</sup> "there is no one to ordain clergy, to consecrate virgins:" the confiscated property is said to be a robbery of the poor: yet in general the sole object in dispute was the absolute immunity of the clergy from civil jurisdiction,<sup>k</sup> the right of appeal from

<sup>f</sup> On the effect of the death, and the immediate concourse of the people to Canterbury, Lambeth. p. 133.

<sup>g</sup> Herbert de Bosham, writing fourteen years after Becket's death, declares him among the most undisputed martyrs. "Quod alicujus martyrum causa justior fuit aut apertior ego nec audivi, nec legi." So completely were clerical immunities part and parcel of Christianity.

<sup>h</sup> The enemies of Becket assigned base reasons for his opposition to the King. "Ecclesiasticam etiam libertatem, quam defensatis, non ad animarum lucrum sed ad augmentum pecuniarum, episcopos ventros intorquere." See the

charges urged by John of Oxford.—Giles, iv. p. 188.

<sup>i</sup> Especially in Epist. 19. "Interim."

<sup>k</sup> It is not just to judge the clergy by the crimes of individual men, but there is one case, mentioned by no less an authority than John of Salisbury, too flagrant to pass over: it was in Becket's own cathedral city. Immediately after Becket's death the Bishops of Exeter and Worcester were commissioned by Pope Alexander to visit St. Augustine's, Canterbury. They report the total dilapidation of the buildings and estates. The prior elect "Jugi, quod hereticus damnat, fluit libidine, et hinnit

the temporal sovereign to Rome, and the asserted superiority of the spiritual rulers in every respect over the temporal power. There might, indeed, be latent advantages to mankind, social, moral, and religious, in this secluded sanctity of one class of men; it might be well that there should be a barrier against the fierce and ruffian violence of kings and barons; that somewhere freedom should find a voice, and some protest be made against the despotism of arms, especially in a newly-conquered country like England, where the kingly and aristocratic power was still foreign: above all, that there should be a caste, not an hereditary one, into which ability might force its way up, from the most low-born, even from the servile rank. But the liberties of the Church, as they were called, were but the establishment of one tyranny—a milder, perhaps, but not less rapacious tyranny—instead of another; a tyranny which aspired to uncontrolled, irresponsible rule, nor was above the inevitable evil produced on rulers as well as on subjects, from the consciousness of arbitrary and autocratic power.

*Verdict of posterity.* Reflective posterity may perhaps consider as not the least remarkable point in this lofty and tragic strife that it was but a strife for power. Henry II. was a sovereign who, with many noble and kingly qualities, lived, more than even most monarchs of his age, in direct violation of every Christian precept of justice, humanity, conjugal fidelity. He was lustful, cruel, treacherous, arbitrary. But throughout this contest there is no remonstrance whatever from Primate or

---

"In feminas, adeo impudens ut libidinem, tioni abusum comparat necessitati." nisi quam publicaverit, voluptuosam In one village he had seventeen bastards, esse non reputat." He debauched —Epist. 310.  
mothers and daughters: "Fornica-

Pope against his disobedience to the laws of God, only to those of the Church. Becket *might*, indeed, if he had retained his full and acknowledged religious power, have rebuked the vices, protected the subjects, interceded for the victims of the King's unbridled passions. It must be acknowledged by all that he did not take the wisest course to secure this which might have been beneficent influence. But as to what appears, if the King would have consented to allow the churchmen to despise all law—if he had not insisted on hanging priests guilty of homicide as freely as laymen—he might have gone on unreproved in his career of ambition; he might unrebuked have seduced or ravished the wives and daughters of his nobles; extorted, without remonstrance of the Clergy, any revenue from his subjects, if he had kept his hands from the treasures of the Church. Henry's real tyranny was not (would it in any case have been?) the object of the churchman's censure, oppugnancy, or resistance. The cruel and ambitious and rapacious King would doubtless have lived unexcommunicated and died with plenary absolution.

## CHAPTER IX.

Alexander III. and the Popes to the close of the Twelfth Century.

THE history of Becket has been throughout almost its whole course that of Pope Alexander III.: it has shown the Pontiff as an exile in France, and after his return to Rome. The support of the English Primate, more or less courageous and resolute, or wavering and lukewarm, has been in exact measure to his own prosperity and danger. When Alexander seems to abandon the cause of the English Primate, he is trembling before his own adversaries, or embarrassed with increasing difficulties; when he boldly, either through himself or his legates, takes part against the King of England, it is because he feels strong enough to stand without the countenance or without the large pecuniary aids lavished by Henry.

Alexander remained in France above three years.  
April, 1162, to Sept. 1165. During that time the kingdom of Sicily was restored to peace and order; the Emperor had returned to Germany, where he seemed likely to be fully occupied with domestic wars; the Italian republics were groaning under the oppressive yoke of their conqueror, which they were watching the opportunity to throw off, Milan, given up to ruin, fire, and, most destructive of all, to the fury of her enemies, was razed to the earth, if not sown with salt. Lodi, Cremona, Pavia, had risen from her ashes; but walls had grown up, trenches sunk around the condemned city. Milan's old allies had rivalled in zeal, activity, and devotion her

revengeful foes. Her scattered citizens had returned. The Archbishop's palace towered in its majesty, the churches lifted up their pinnacles and spires, the republic had resumed its haughtiness, its turbulence.<sup>a</sup> The Antipope Victor was dead,<sup>b</sup> but a new Antipope was not wanting. The Emperor might, without loss of honour, have made peace with Alexander; but the Imperialist churchmen dared not trust a Pope whom they had denied to be Pope. The Archbishop of Cologne and the German and Lombard prelates proclaimed Guido of Crema by the title of Paschal III.; he was consecrated by the Bishop of Liège. But the Antipope had not dared to contest Rome; he was, in fact, a German Antipope overawed by German prelates. In Rome the vicegerent of Pope Alexander ruled with almost undisturbed sway; but in that vicegerent had taken place an important change. Julius, the Cardinal of Palestrina, died; the Cardinal of St. John and St. Paul was appointed in his place. This Cardinal was a man of great address and activity. By artful language and well-directed bribery, notwithstanding all the opposition of Christian, the Chancellor of the Empire, he won over the versatile people; the senate were entirely at his disposal.

The Pope, at the summons of his Vicar, and lavishly supplied with money by the Kings of France and England, embarked, on the octave of the Assumption of the Virgin, at Marseilles, himself in one vessel, the cardinals of his party and Oberto, the anti-Imperialist Archbishop of Milan, in another. They were watched by the fleet of Pisa, in the interests

Sept. 1165.  
Alexander  
embarks for  
Italy.

<sup>a</sup> Ann. 1162. On the extent of the destruction of Milan, and its restoration, compare Verri, *Storia di Milano*, c. vii. He gives the authorities in full.

<sup>b</sup> April 1164. In Lucca.

of the Emperor. The vessel which conveyed the cardinals was taken, searched in vain for the person of the Pope, and then released; that with the Pope on board put back into the port. Shortly after in a <sup>Early in November.</sup> smaller and swift-sailing bark he reached Messina; there he received a splendid embassy from the King of Sicily; several large vessels were placed at his command. The Archbishop of Reggio (in Calabria) and many barons of Southern Italy joined themselves to

<sup>Nov. 22.</sup> the cardinals around him. The fleet landed at Ostia: the clergy and senators of Rome crowded to pay their homage to the Pope. He was escorted to the city by numbers bearing olive-branches. At the Lateran gate the clergy in their sacred vestments, the authorities of the city and the militia under

<sup>Nov. 24.</sup> their banners, the Jews with their Bible in their hands, presented themselves; and in the midst of this festive procession he took possession of the Lateran palace.

But it was not the policy of the Hohenstaufen Emperor to desert the cause of his Antipope, and to leave Alexander in secure possession of Rome. After the Pope had occupied Rome for a year, in the following year Frederick crossed the Alps with a great force. Rainald, Archbishop of Cologne and Arch-chancellor of

<sup>A.D. 1167</sup> Italy, preceded his march towards the south.

Pisa received him: the Alexandrine archbishop, Villani, was degraded, Benencasa installed as archbishop.<sup>c</sup> Rome was notoriously the prize of the highest bidder; it had been bought by Alexander with the gold of France, England, and Sicily;<sup>d</sup> many were

\* "Quem venerabilis Pasqualis cum cancellario, et cardinalibus gloriose recepit."—Marangoni, p. 47.

<sup>d</sup> "Roma si invenerit emptorem, venalem se preberet."—Vit. Alex. III.

disposed to be bought again by the Emperor. Rainald of Cologne, an active, daring, and unscrupulous partisan, made great progress in the neighbourhood of Rome and in Rome itself in favour of the Antipope. The Emperor, at the head of his army, moved slowly southwards. Instead, however, of marching direct to Rome, he sat down before Ancona, which had returned or been subdued to its allegiance to the Byzantine Empire; for the Byzantine Manuel Comnenus had found leisure to mingle himself again in the affairs of Italy; he even aspired to reunite Rome to what the Byzantines still called the Roman Empire.<sup>e</sup> Ancona made a brave resistance, and the Imperial forces were thus diverted from the capital.

The feeble Romans were constant to one passion alone, the hatred of their neighbours; that hatred was now centred on Tusculum. Notwithstanding all the remonstrances of the more prudent Pope, the whole militia of Rome, on whom depended the power of resistance to the Emperor, marched out to attack the detested neighbour. They suffered a disgraceful defeat by a few German troops, headed by the Archbishop of Mentz, their general, and the garrison of Tusculum under the command of the Archbishop of Cologne. Their loss was great and irre- End of  
May, 1167.

\* Cinnamus, vi. 4. 261, ed. Bonn. According to the Byzantine, the Pope had agreed to this. ἐσ τὸ πάλαι θεος ἀνακεχωρηκέναι τοῦ ἐν 'Ρώμῃ ἀρχιερέως συνομολογήσαντος. Alexander was well content to accept Greek gold, not Greek rule. Did Manuci fondly believe his sincerity? In 1171 (Feb. 28), Alexander, alarmed at a proposition of marriage between the

son of the Emperor Frederick and the daughter of the King of France, offers to the King of France to procure for his daughter the hand of the son of the Byzantine emperor, "whose treasury is inexhaustible." "Sanè apud imperatorem (Constantinopolitanum) regnum et consanguinei puellæ ærarium indeficiens semper invenient."—Apud Bouquet, xv. 901.

these warlike churchmen afflicted even to tears but did not subdue the courage of the resolute Pontiff.<sup>f</sup> He strengthened as far as he could the fortifications of Rome; a few troops were obtained from the Queen Regent of Sicily (William II. was now dead) and the youthful king. Frederick had broken up the siege of Ancona; he reached Rome, and easily got possession of the Leonine city; the Vatican alone maintained an obstinate defence, till some of the buildings caught fire and compelled the garrison to capitulate. The Anti-pope took possession of St. Peter's, reeking with blood up

<sup>July 30.</sup> to the high altar,<sup>g</sup> and performed the papal functions. The Emperor attended; the Empress Beatrice received the imperial diadem, and the crown of Frederick was blessed again by the Pontiff.

Alexander seemed at first determined to defend to the utmost the city on the other side of the Tiber. Some Sicilian vessels had sailed up the river to bring supplies of money and to convey him away. Alexander refused <sup>Alexander at Bene-</sup> vento. to embark. The Frangipanis and the house of Peter Leonis were firm and united in his cause. Before long he thought it more prudent to escape in disguise to Gaeta; there he resumed the pontifical attire and withdrew to Benevento.

Rome consoled herself for her enforced submission by the re-establishment of her senate in supreme <sup>Aug. 22.</sup> authority. The Emperor endeavoured, by the grant of various immunities, to secure the fidelity of the

<sup>f</sup> “Paucissimi evaserunt, qui non occisi, aut captivati fuerint.”—Chronicon Reichspurg. The best account of the victory of these martial prelates is in Otto de Saint Blaise, c. xx.

\* Otto de Saint Blaise. He says

that the imperial troops hewed down the gates of St. Peter's with axes and hatchets, and fought their way to the high altar, slaying as they went.—Compare Marangoni, p. 48.

people; but the Frangipanis, the Peter Leonis, and many of the nobles, remained aloof in sullen silence, and kept within their impregnable fortress palaces. But the Pope had a more powerful ally. Never did the climate of Rome so fearfully humiliate the pride of the Emperor, or work with such awful force for the liberation of Italy.<sup>h</sup> No wonder that the visible Pestilence. hand of God was seen in the epidemic which broke out in the German army. It seemed, as has been said, commissioned with especial violence against those rebellious churchmen who had taken part and stood in arms against the lawful Pope. The Archbishop Elect of Cologne, the Bishops of Prague, Liège, Spires, Ratisbon, Verdun, Augsburg, Zeitz, were among its first victims. With them perished Duke Frederick of Swabia, the young Duke Guelf, in whom expired the line of the Estensian Guelfs. The pestilence was no less terrific from its rapidity than from its intensity. Men were in perfect health in the morning, dead before the evening: it was hardly possible to perform the rites of decent burial. The Emperor broke up his camp in the utmost haste, retreated, not without hostile re- Retreat of  
Barbarossa.  
Sept. 4, 1167.sistance in the pass of Pontremoli, by Lucca and Pisa to Pavia. Of nobles, bishops, knights, and squires, not reckoning the common soldiers, he had lost 2000 by the plague and during his retreat. Nor was this the worst: all Lombardy was in arms. A league had been formed to throw off his tyrannical yoke by Venice, Verona and all her dependencies, Vicenza, Padua, Treviso, Ferrara, Brescia, Bergamo, Cremona,

<sup>h</sup> Here perhaps may once more be cited Peter Damiani's lines, almost equally appropriate on every German invasion :

"Roma vorax hominum, domat ardua colla virorum,  
Roma ferax febrium, necis est uberrima frugum,  
Romane febres stabili sunt jure fideles."  
—c. lxxii.

Milan, Lodi, Piacenza, Parma, Mantua, Modena, and Bologna. The Emperor was not safe in Pavia: early in the spring of the next year the haughty Barbarossa

<sup>A.D. 1168.</sup> hardly found his way to Germany in disguise; with greater difficulty the wreck of his army stole through the passes of the Alps.<sup>i</sup>

With the flight of the Emperor fell the cause of the Antipope. City after city declared its allegiance to Alexander. The Antipope maintained himself in St. Peter's, but his death in the autumn of the year might have been expected to terminate the schism. No

<sup>Sept. 20, 1168.</sup> single cardinal of his faction remained; but the obstinate few who adhered to him persuaded John, formerly Abbot of Struma, now Bishop of Tusculum, to assume the papacy under the name of Calixtus III. His legates were received by Frederick

<sup>June 23, 1169. 1170.</sup> at a great diet at Bamberg; yet the Emperor did not scruple during the following year to send Eberhard, the Bishop of Bamberg, to negotiate with Alexander, now avowedly the head of the Lombard League. The great fortress which had been erected in the plains of Piedmont, as the impregnable place of arms for the League, was named after the Pope, Alexandria. The Pontiff was too sagacious not to perceive that the object of these peaceful offers was to alienate him from his allies, the King of Sicily, the Emperor of Constantinople, and the Lombard cities. The Pope received Eberhard of Bamberg at Veroli;<sup>k</sup> since the Bishop had no authority to acknowledge him unreservedly as Pope, he was dismissed with haughty

<sup>i</sup> "Sicque evaens Imperator, trans-  
cursis Alpibus, exercitum, morte,  
morbo, omniq[ue] miserâ confectum, in  
patriam reduxit." — Otto de Saint

Blaise, c. xx. See back, p. 89.

<sup>k</sup> Alexander was at Veroli from  
March to September.

courtesy. Yet Alexander dared not to take up his abode in Rome. The Prefect still commanded there in the name of the Emperor; and Tusculum, hard pressed by the Romans, whom the Prefect could not but indulge in their hope of vengeance for their late defeat, surrendered first to the Prefect, afterwards to the Pope as the mightier protector. To increase the confusion, Manuel the Eastern Emperor pressed more vigorously his intrigues to regain a footing in Italy. He condescended to court the Frangipani by granting his daughter in marriage to a prince of that powerful house. The Pope, still at Veroli, gave his blessing to the nuptials. Rome now offered her unqualified allegiance to the Pope at the price of the sacrifice of Tusculum,<sup>m</sup> A.D. 1172. which had yielded herself into his hands, and where he had held his papal state more than two years. Alexander consented to raze her impregnable walls; his treachery to Tusculum was punished by the treachery of the Romans. When the walls of her hated rival were levelled they laughed to scorn their own agreement. Alexander retired to Anagni, revenging himself by fortifying again the denuded city of Tusculum.<sup>n</sup>

It was not till above three years after, when the pride of Barbarossa had been humbled by his total defeat at Legnano, the battle-field in May 29, 1176. Defeat of Legnano. which the Lombard republics won their independence, that Alexander could trust the earnest wishes of the Emperor for peace. The Emperor could no longer refuse to recognise a pontiff at the head of the League of his conquerors; it was of awful omen that the fortress named after the Pope had borne, before the fatal

<sup>m</sup> His bulls bear date at Tusculum, from Oct. 17, 1170, to Jan. 1173.—Jaffé, *Regesta*.

<sup>n</sup> He was at Segni, Jan. 27, 1173; at Anagni, March 28.

battle, all the brunt of the war, and defied his mightiest armament. A secret treaty, now that a treaty was

Nov. 12. necessary for both parties, arranged the chief points in dispute between the Pope and the Emperor; the general pacification was not publicly proclaimed till the following year.

Then the Pope, under the safe conduct of the Emperor, embarked with his retinue in eleven stately galleys, for Venice. He was received with the highest honours by the doge, Sebastiano Ziani,<sup>o</sup> and the senators.

The Pope at Venice. March 13, 1177. Some dispute took place as to the city in which was to be holden the general congress; the Lombards proposed Bologna; the Em-

peror Venice; and Venice was at length agreed upon by all parties. But though the terms of reconciliation between the Pope and the Emperor might be arranged with no great difficulty, and on their main points had been settled before at Anagni (the full recognition of Alexander—the abandonment of the Antipope, was the one important article), more embarrassing questions arose on the terms insisted on by the Pope's allies, especially the Lombard republics. The Emperor demanded the full acknowledgment of all the imperial rights recognised at the diet of Roncaglia, and claimed or enjoyed by his predecessors. The republics insisted on the confirmation of their customs as recognised by

Truce of Venice. the late emperors, Henry V., Conrad, and Lothair. As peace seemed impracticable, the Pope at length suggested a truce. The Emperor at first indignantly rejected this proposition, but was prevailed on to yield to a truce of six years with the Lombard League; of fifteen with the King of Sicily. In

---

• He embarked at Viesti, March 9, 1177.

the mean time the Emperor was to retain possession of the domains of the Countess Matilda: after that they were to revert to the Pope. The Lombards bitterly complained of this abandonment of their cause; they had borne the brunt and expenditure of the war; the Pope only consulted his own advantage. But Alexander judged more wisely of their real interests. The cities during the truce were more likely to increase in wealth and power, might quietly strengthen their fortifications, and gather the resources of war; the Emperor, in that time, might be involved in new hostilities in Germany. At all events the Christian prelate might fully determine to obtain a suspension of arms, if he could not a permanent peace: the chances of peace were better for all parties than those of war.

The Emperor then advanced towards Venice. When he arrived at Chioggia, the eager and tumultuous populace were disposed to transport him into the city, without precaution or exchange of hostages. The distrustful Pope was so alarmed, that he kept his galleys prepared for flight. The Lombard deputies actually set out towards Treviso. But the grave wisdom of the Doge Ziani, and of the senate, appeased the popular movement, arranged and guaranteed the ceremonial for the proclamation of the peace on the meeting of the Pope and of the Emperor.

On Tuesday the 24th of July, the Pope went in great state to the Church of St. Mark: the Doge, with the Bucentaur, and other splendid galleys, to meet the Emperor at S. Niccolo del Lido.<sup>p</sup> The bishops of Ostia,

<sup>p</sup> Daru alone, of modern historians, adheres to the old fables, as old as the fourteenth century, of the march of Frederick towards Anagni; the flight of the Pope in disguise to Venice, where he was recognised; Frederick's pursuit to Tarento; the defeat of his great fleet of seventeen large galleys

Porto, and Palestrina, with other cardinals, were sent forward to absolve the Emperor and his adherents from the ban of excommunication. The warlike Archbishop of Mentz, and the other German prelates, abjured the Antipopes, Octavian, Guido of Crema, and John of Struma. The Emperor, with the Doge and senators, and with his own Teutonic nobles, advanced to the portal of St. Mark's, where stood the Pope in his pontifical attire. Frederick no sooner beheld the successor of St. Peter, than he threw off his imperial mantle, prostrated himself, and kissed the feet of the Pontiff. Alexander, not without tears, raised him up, and gave him the kiss of peace. Then swelled out the *Te Deum*; and the Emperor, holding the hand of the Pope, was led into the choir, and received the papal benediction. From thence they proceeded together to the Ducal Palace.<sup>4</sup> The next day, the feast of St. James the

by the Venetians, and the capture of his son Otho; finally, the Pope's insolent behaviour to the Emperor; his placing his feet upon his neck, with the words, "Super aspida et basiliscum ponam pedes nostros;" Frederick's indignant reply, "Non tibi, sed Petro." The account appears in a passage of Dandolo (in Chron.) of questioned authenticity, which appeals to, but does not cite, earlier Venetian histories. But the total silence and the irreconcileable accounts of the contemporary historians and of the Papal letters must outweigh these dubious authorities. A more powerful, but, from his Venetian patriotism, less impartial, advocate than Daru, Paolo Sarpi, had before maintained the same views. Yet such a fiction is extraordinary. Venetian pride might invent the part

which redounds to the glory of Venice: but who invented the striking interview between the Emperor and the Pope? It is not an improbable suggestion, that it originated in paintings, representing the Pope and the Emperor in such attitudes. The paintings are by Spinello, a Siennese, of which city Alexander III. was a native. Compare the vivid description of these frescoes, Lord Lindsay, *Hist. of Christian Art*, ii. 315. Spinello painted in the latter half of the fourteenth century. As Poetry has so often become, here Painting for once became History.

<sup>4</sup> A curious passage from a newly-recovered poem, if poem it may be called, by Godfrey of Viterbo, an attendant on the Empcror, gives an incident worth notice. So great was

Apostle, the Pope celebrated mass, and preached to the people. The Emperor held his stirrup when he departed from the church; but the courtesy of the Pope prevented him from holding the bridle along the Place of St. Mark. At a great council held in the church, the Pope excommunicated all who should infringe the treaty.

Thus Venice might seem to have the glory of mediating a peace, which at least suspended for some years all the horrors of war—the war which, throughout Italy, had arrayed city against city, on the Papal or Imperialist factions.<sup>1</sup> They had assisted in terminating a disastrous schism which had distracted Christendom for so many years.

Even Rome was overawed by the unity between the Emperor and the Pope. The city sent seven of her nobles to entreat Alexander to honour Rome with his presence. After some negotiation a treaty was agreed on. The senate continued to subsist, but swore fealty and rendered homage to the Pope; the Church of St. Peter, and the royalties seized by the people, were restored. Alexander took possession of the Lateran palace, and celebrated Easter with April 9, 1178. great pomp. In the August of the same year the Anti-

the press in the market that the aged Pope was thrown down :—

“ Jam Papa perisset in arto,  
Cæsar ibi vetulum ni relevasset eum.”

This is an odd contrast of real life with romance.—Apud Pertz, Archiv. iv. p. 363.

\* Muratori has given the list. On the Emperor's side were Cremona (Pisa ?), Pavia, Genoa, Tortona, Asti, Albi, Acqua, Turin, Ventimiglia, Savona, Albengo, Casale, Montevro,

Castel Bolognese, Imola, Faenza, Ravenna, Forli, Forlimpopoli, Cesena, Rimini, the Marquises of Montferrat, Guasto, and Bosco, the Counts of Blandrate and Lomello. In the League, Venice, Treviso, Padua, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia, Ferrara, Mantua, Bergamo, Lodi, Milan, Como, Novara, Vercelli, Alexandria, Carsino and Belmonte, Piacenza, Bobbio, the Marquis Malespina, Parma, Reggio, Modena, Bologna, Doccia, San Cassiano, &c.

pope, Calixtus III., abdicated his vain title. He had fled to Viterbo, determined to maintain a vigorous resistance; he received a message from the Emperor, threatening him, if he refused to submit, with the ban of the Empire. He fled on to Montalbano; he was received by John, the lord of that castle, whose design, it is said, was to sell him at a high price to Alexander. In Montalbano he was besieged by the Archbishop of Mentz, who wasted all the territory around.<sup>s</sup> Calixtus, in despair, threw himself on the mercy of his enemy; he went to Tusculum, fell at the feet of Alexander, confessed his sin of schism, and implored forgiveness.

<sup>Aug. 29, 1183.</sup> Alexander received him with Christian gentleness, and even advanced him afterwards to a post of dignity—the government of the city of Benevento.

A great council in the Lateran was the last important <sup>Aug. 29, 1178.</sup> act in the long and eventful pontificate of <sup>Mar. 17, 1179.</sup> Alexander.<sup>t</sup> He died in Civita Castellana.

Thus closed the first act of the great tragedy, the strife of the Popes with the imperial house of Hohen-

\* This fierce prelate, whom in the Treaty of Venice Pope Alexander had recognised as rightful Archbishop of Mentz, was afterwards involved in a quarrel with the Marquis of Montferrat concerning the possession of Viterbo. The people were for the archbishop, and the Pope, Lucius III., now his ally; the nobles for Conrad, son of the Marquis. The archbishop was taken and kept for some time in iron chains. He ransomed himself at a great price, fought many more battles, and died at length of a fever.—Muratori, 1179.

\* This Council, among other acts,

regulated the election of the Pope (Romuald-Salernit.); he must have two-thirds of the suffrages. It enacted sumptuary laws as to the horses of prelates on their visitation; hawks and hounds and costly banquets were prohibited; the Knights-Templars and Hospitallers were to be under episcopal authority; clerks to have no women in their houses. There were Canons on the house of God; in favour of lepers; against Christians furnishing arms to Saracens; against wreckers; against Jews and Saracens having Christian slaves. Cathari, Paterines, Publicans were anathematised.

staufen. The Pope had gained a signal victory; he had won back the now uncontested papacy, and the city of Rome. He was at the head of a mighty Italian interest, both in the South and in the North, Sicily and the Lombard League. Yet though humbled, Barbarossa was still of formidable power; he had subdued, driven into exile his one dangerous German subject, the rebel Henry the Lion. Many cities, and some of the most powerful, were firmly attached to the imperial cause, the more firmly from their internecine hatred each to some other of the cities of the League; the proverbial animosity of Guelf and Ghibelline had begun to rage. Till towards the close of this century the Papacy might seem to be in quiet repose, gathering its strength for the great culminating manifestation of its power in Innocent III.

Five Popes,<sup>a</sup> neither distinguished by their personal character, nor by the events of their pontificate, passed in succession, during less than twenty years, over the scene. Of these Popes two alone honoured Rome by their residence. The three first can hardly be called Bishops of Rome.

On the death of Alexander he was succeeded by a native of Lucca, Ubaldo, Bishop of Ostia and Velletri. Lucius III. (this was his pontifical name) retained his residence, probably his bishopric of Velletri. Rome, rarely visited by Alexander, for six months endured the presence of her new pontiff.<sup>x</sup> Then Rome was again in rebellion: the Pope at Velletri,

<sup>a</sup> Lucius III., inaugurated Nov. 1181 . . 1185  
Urban III. " . . . 1185 . . 1187  
Gregory VIII. " . . . 1187 . . 1187  
Clement III. " . . . 1187 . . 1190  
Coelestine III. " . . . 1190 Jan. 1198

<sup>x</sup> September, 1181, March, 1182.

afterwards at Anagni. The cruelty and insolence of the Romans was at its height. They blinded six-and-twenty Tuscan prisoners, and set cardinal's hats on their heads; a wretch with one eye left was crowned with the papal tiara, inscribed "Lucius III., the worthless, the deceiver." In this plight they were ordered to present themselves to the Pope in Anagni.<sup>y</sup>

The Pope and the Emperor, and the north of Italy, were still at peace. Even Alexandria had opened her gates, and for a short time took the name of Cæsarea. The famous treaty of Constance seemed to fix the relations of the Emperor and the Lombard republics on a lasting ground. At Verona met the Emperor

A.D. 1183.

and the Pope in apparent amity. Frederick had hopes that the Pope would consent to permit him to devolve the imperial crown upon his son. Lucius had the address to suggest that a second emperor could not be crowned till the reigning emperor had actually abdicated the empire. They parted in mutual mistrust; but the Pope remained at Verona.<sup>z</sup> Lucius III. had fulminated an anathema against the sects which were now spreading in the north of Italy, and were all included under the hated name of Manichæans, the Cathari, the Paterines, the Umiliati, the poor men of Lyons, the Passagini, the Giuseppini; he had visited with the like censures the Arnoldists and rebels of Rome. The Emperor left the papal thunders to their own unaided effects; he moved no troops; he would not break the peace of Italy, either to persecute the heretics, or to subdue Rome.

The cardinals, like the Pope, had abandoned the

<sup>y</sup> Chron. Foss nov.

He was at Verona from July 25 to his death in 1185.

south for the north of Italy. On the death of Lucius, Uberto, or Humbert Crivelli, his successor, Death of Urban III., elected by twenty-seven cardinals,<sup>a</sup> Nov. 25, 1185. retained the archbishopric of Milan (thus Urban III. holding at once the two great sees of Italy); he chiefly resided at Verona. The peace of Venice had seemed but precarious during the pontificate of Lucius. Uberto Crivelli, the Archbishop of Milan, and full of Milanese as well as papal jealousy of the Emperor, was not likely to smooth away the causes of animosity. Urban the Turbulent (Turbanus), such was the ill-omened name which he received from his enemies, was more the republican Archbishop (in that character he had already, even in war, been among the most dangerous enemies of Barbarossa) than the supreme Pontiff. There were three fatal points in dispute, each sufficient to break up so hasty a treaty; to estrange powers who had such little sympathy with each other. In Germany Frederick was accused of seizing the estates of vacant sees, confiscating all the moveable property, and even compelling the alienation of farms, lands, towns, and other rights; of suppressing monasteries, especially of nuns, under the pretext that they had sunk into licence and irregularity. In Italy the great question of succession to the territories of the Countess Matilda had been only adjourned; the longer the Emperor maintained the possession, the less disposed was he to fulfil his covenant for the restoration of these wealthy domains to the Roman see. The third and most dangerous controversy concerned the coronation of his son, if not as Emperor, as King of Italy. The Emperor had made with success a master-stroke of policy; he had obtained

\* Ciacconius gives their names.—*Vit. Pontif.*

the hand of Constantia, the heiress of the kingdom of Sicily, for his son and heir Henry. The kingdom of Sicily was thus, instead of a place of refuge for the Pope against the Emperor, now an imperial territory; the King, instead of a vassal holding his realm as an acknowledged fief of the papacy, the Pope's implacable antagonist. The Pope was placed, at Rome, between two fires. Urban III. strove in vain against the perilous marriage; he resolutely refused the coronation of Henry with the iron crown of Italy: this was his function as Archbishop of Milan. The office was assumed by the Bishop of Aquileia. The conduct of the ferocious Henry, the son and heir of Barbarossa, the husband of the Sicilian Constantia, aggravated the terrors of beholding the crown of Sicily on the brows of a Hohenstaufen. While yet in Lombardy, he demanded of a bishop "of whom he held the investiture of his see?" "Of the Pope alone," three times replied the resolute ecclesiastic. Henry ordered his attendants to seize, to beat, and to roll in the mire the obstinate prelate. In the south he entered into an alliance with the rebel senate of Rome. A servant of the Pope, on the way from Rome with a large sum of money, was seized by his command, stripped of his treasures, and sent empty-handed, and with his nose cut off, to the Pope. The Emperor took measures, if not of equal ferocity, of more menacing hostility. He commanded the passes of the Alps to be occupied, to prevent all communication of the German ecclesiastics with the Pope; who was all this time holding his court, it might be supposed, in the midst of the Emperor's Italian territory in Verona. He commanded the Archbishop of Cologne, the Pope's legate, to assume complete ecclesiastical supremacy, and to decide all causes without the cognisance of the

Pope.<sup>b</sup> At a full diet at Gelnhausen, Barbarossa arraigned the Pope, as having refused to crown his son; as having excommunicated the bishops who at the Emperor's command had officiated at that ceremony; of consecrating Fulmar Archbishop of Treves, without the approbation of the Emperor. Fulmar was finally expelled; Rudolf, the Emperor's partisan, consecrated Archbishop of Treves. Frederick disposed at his will of the German sees. The German bishops were called upon to aid their Emperor in his resistance to this contumacious Pope. They offered their mediation; they signed and sealed a document, imploring the Pope in these perilous times not to renew the old fatal wars; they urged him at least to politic dissimulation; at the same time they represented the exactions of his legates, and complained of the contributions levied by his officers on the monasteries in Germany, some of which had been reduced to penury. Urban III. at length determined on the excommunication of Frederick; but the citizens of Verona declared that no such act of hostility should take place within their walls.

Urban departed to Ferrara; for this act of resistance on the part of Verona was of evil augury, as to the indisposition of his only remaining allies, the Lombard republics, to risk their growing opulence in his cause. At Ferrara he died. Of his

<sup>b</sup> Urban III. writes to Wickman, Archbishop of Magdeburg, to use his good offices to soothe the Emperor. "Commonitam frequenter a sese imperialis culminis altitudinem ut ecclesiae Romane restitueret possessiones, quas distineret occupatas, non ea qua debuerat serenitate respondisse, nec videri velle perficere, per quod inter ecclesiam

et imperium firma possit pax et concordia evenire."—Feb. 24, 1187. This from almost the immediate successor of Alexander III., the antecessor only by ten years of Innocent III., and from such a man as the turbulent Urban. It was a great stroke of policy to make Lombard Popes.

death there is an account by one who solemnly protests to the truth of his statement—he was an eye-witness. Peter of Blois rode with the Pope from Verona towards Ferrara. Peter endeavoured to appease the deadly hatred which had been instilled into the soul of Urban against Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Pope, red with anger, broke out, “ May I never dismount this horse and mount another, if I do not depose him ! ” He had hardly spoken, when the cross borne before him was dashed in pieces. It was hastily tied together. At the next town Urban fell ill : he never again mounted a horse.<sup>c</sup> He was conveyed slowly by water to Ferrara. Through Christendom it was reported that the cause of his hatred against the English Prelate was this : Baldwin of Canterbury had set up a chapter of secular canons against the unruly monks of Canterbury ; the monks appealed to Rome, and had inflamed the Pope with implacable resentment against Baldwin.

The peace of European Christendom was owing less to the respect for recent treaties, to either satiety of ambition in the contending parties, or the seeming isolation of the Pope, than to the calamities in the East. The rise of the great Saladin had appalled, it had even extorted generous admiration from the chivalrous kings of the West. But when Jerusalem fell before the Saracen, the loss afflicted all Christendom with grief and shame ; at one blow all the glories of the Crusades were levelled to the dust. The war was to begin anew, and if with a nobler enemy, and one more worthy to conflict with European kings—with an enemy more

<sup>c</sup> See the very curious letter of Peter of Blois. Peter says that he had been at school with Urban at Marlborough (Maldebyrig), and was also Baldwin's *commensalis*.—Epist. 216. Giles, ii. p. 165. On Baldwin's quarrel with the monks, see Collier, i. p. 383.

formidable—one unconquered, it might seem unconquerable. Urban hardly retired to Ferrara, and died of grief, it was said (though the news could not possibly have reached Italy), for this disaster.<sup>a</sup>

But Urban knew not that this disaster would save the papacy from its imminent peril; it diverted at once even Barbarossa himself from his hostile plans; it awed the most implacable enemies in Christendom to peace and amity. The first act of Gregory VIII.<sup>b</sup> (Albert, Cardinal of St. Lorenzo in Lucina) was to issue lamentable letters to the whole of Christendom. They described in harrowing terms the fall of Jerusalem. Saladin (for the cross of Christ had ceased to be the unconquerable defence of the Christians) had overthrown the whole Christian host; had broken into the holy city; the cross itself was taken, the Bishop slain, the King a prisoner, many knights of the Temple and of St. John beheaded. This was the Divine visitation for the sins, not of the kingdom of Jerusalem, but of Christendom: it might melt the hearts, not only of all believers, but of mankind. The Pope exhorted all men to take arms, or at least to offer the amplest contributions for the relief of their imperilled brethren, and the recovery of the city, the sepulchre, the cross of the Lord. He appointed a fast for five years, to appease the wrath of God. Every Friday in the year was to be observed as Lent; on Wednesdays and Saturdays meat was forbidden. To these days of abstinence the Pope and the cardinals were to add Monday. The cardinals imposed on themselves even more exemplary duties: to take the cross, to go to the Holy Land as mendicant pilgrims, tc

<sup>a</sup> Urban left Verona in September; Jerusalem fell on the 2nd October. Urban died on the 20th.

<sup>b</sup> Gregory, consecrated Oct. 25, 1187. The letters are dated Oct. 29.

receive no presents from those who came on business to the papal court; not to mount on horseback, but to go on foot so long as the ground on which the Saviour walked was trodden by the feet of the unbeliever.<sup>f</sup> Gregory set off for Pisa to reconcile the hostile republics of Pisa and Genoa, in order that their mighty Dec. 17, 1187. armaments might combine for the reconquest of Palestine. But Gregory died before he had completed the second month of his pontificate.

His successor, elected two days after his decease, was Clement III. by birth a Roman, Paul Cardinal of Palestrina : Dec. 19. he took the Roman name of Clement III. The pontificate was rescued from the immediate influence of the northern republics, and, as a Roman, Clement had the natural ambition to restore the Papacy to Rome. Rome herself had now again grown weary of that republican freedom which was bought at the cost of her wealth, her importance, her magnificence. Rome inhabited by the Pope was the centre of the civilised world ; as an independent republic, only an inheritor of a barren name and of unproductive glory. Yet must the Pope purchase his restoration by the sacrifice of Tusculum and of Tivoli; to a Roman perhaps no heartfelt sacrifice. Tivoli had become an object of jealousy, as Tusculum formerly of implacable hatred. On these terms Clement III. obtained not merely his safe return A.D. 1188. to Rome, but the restoration of the Papal royalties from the Roman people. The republic by this treaty recognised the sovereignty of the Pope; the patriciate was abolished, a prefect named with more limited powers. The senators were to be annually elected, to receive the approbation and swear allegiance

---

<sup>f</sup> Hoveden.

to the Pope. St. Peter's Church and all its domains were restored to the Pope; of the tolls which were levied one-third was to be expended for the use of the Roman people. The senate and people were to respect the majesty and maintain the honour and dignity of the Roman Pontiff; the Roman Pontiff to bestow the accustomed largesses on the senators, their judges, and officers.<sup>c</sup> Clement III. ruled in peace for two years; he died in Rome.

Hyacinth, Cardinal of St. Maria in Cosmedin, was elected to the Papacy; he took the name of Coelestine III. His first act must be the coronation of the Emperor Henry. Since the loss of Jerusalem the new Crusade had absorbed the mind of Europe. Of all these expeditions none had commenced with greater pomp, and it might seem security of victory. Notwithstanding the prowess of Saladin, could he resist the combined forces, the personal ability and valour of the three greatest monarchs of Europe? Barbarossa himself had yielded to the irresistible enthusiasm; at the head of such an army as might become the great Cæsar of the West, he had set forth by land to Palestine. The Kings of France and of England, Philip Augustus, Richard the Lion-hearted, proceeded by sea. But, if possible, this Crusade was even more disastrous, achieved less and suffered more, than all before. The Emperor Frederick was drowned in a small river of Pisidia; his vast host wasted away, and part only, and that in miserable plight, reached Antioch. The jealousies of Philip Augustus of France and Richard of England made the success of their great army impossible. Philip Augustus left the fame of an

Drowning of  
Barbarossa.

<sup>c</sup> The treaty in Baronius and Muratori, *Antiq. Ital. Dissert.* 32.

accomplished traitor, Richard that of ungovernable pride and cruelty, as well as of unrivalled valour. His chivalrous courage had won the respect of Saladin, his ruthless massacres made his name the terror, for a long time, of Saracen mothers ; but no permanent conquest was made ; the kingdom of Jerusalem was left to sink into a barren title. Richard's short career of glory ended in his long imprisonment in Austria.

The news of Frederick's death had reached Italy before the decease of Clement III. His successor dared

A.D. 1189. not refuse the coronation of Henry, now Lord of Germany and of Sicily. Fiction at times becomes history. It is as important to know what men were believed to do, as what they actually did. The account of Henry's coronation, in an ancient chronicler, cannot but be false in many of its most striking particu-

<sup>Coronation of</sup> lars, as being utterly inconsistent, at least with <sup>the Emperor</sup> Henry. the situation if not with the character of the Pope, no less than with the haughty and unscrupulous demeanour of Henry. The Pope may have beheld with secret satisfaction the seizure of the Sicilian kingdom by Tancred the Norman, the progress made by his arms in the kingdom of Naples, the ill-concealed aversion of the whole realm to the Germans ; he may have looked forward to the time when a new Norman kingdom, detached from the imperial alliance, might afford security to the Roman Pontiff. But Henry was still with his unbroken forces ; the husband of the Queen of Naples ; there was no power at hand to protect the Pope. Cœlestine could as yet reckon on no more than the precarious support of the Romans. Henry, when he appeared with his Empress and his army in the neighbourhood of Rome, might, in his eager desire to secure his coronation, quietly smile at the presumptuous

bearing of the Romans, who manned their walls, and though they would admit the Emperor, refused to open their gates to his German troops; he might condescend to enter alone, and to meet the Pope on the steps of St. Peter's. But the haughty and insulting conduct attributed to Pope Cœlestine only shows what Europe, to a great extent, believed to be the relation in which the Popes supposed themselves to stand towards the Emperor; the wide-spread opinion of the supremacy which they claimed, and which they exercised on all practicable occasions. “Cœlestine sat on his pontifical throne, holding the imperial crown between his feet; the Emperor and Empress bowed their heads, and from between the feet of the Pope received each the crown. But the Lord Pope immediately struck the crown of the Emperor with his foot, and cast it to the ground, signifying that if he should deserve it, it was in the Pope's power to degrade him from the empire. The cardinals caught up the fallen crown and replaced it on the brow of the Emperor.” Such was the notion of an English historian,<sup>a</sup> such in England was proclaimed to be the treatment of the Emperor by the Pope at this solemn time; it was received perhaps more readily, and repeated more emphatically on account of the deep hatred felt by the English nation to the ruling Emperor for his treachery to their captive sovereign King Richard.

Yet for his coronation Henry scrupled not to pay a price even more humiliating, but of which he felt not the humiliation, an act of his characteristic perfidy and cruelty. The Pope had not been able to fulfil that one of the terms of his treaty with the Roman people, which

---

<sup>a</sup> Roger Hoveden. The passage is quoted with manifest satisfaction, as of undoubted authority, by Cardinal Baronius.

was to them of the deepest interest, the demolition of Tusculum. The city had admitted an imperial garrison to protect it from the Pope, and from Rome. The Pope demanded its surrender; without this concession he would not proceed to the coronation. The <sup>Surrender of</sup> <sub>Tusculum.</sub> <sup>A.D. 1191.</sup> garrison received orders, without consulting the citizens, to open the gates to the Romans. The Romans hastened to glut the vengeance of years, unchecked by Emperor or by Pope. They massacred many of the principal citizens, and mutilated the rest; hardly one escaped without the loss of his eyes, his feet, his hands, or some other limb.<sup>i</sup> The walls were levelled to the ground, the citadel razed. Tusculum, the rival, at times the master, the tyrant of Rome, has at length disappeared. The Pope has abandoned the city, which at times enabled him to bridle the unruly populace of Rome; the Emperor one of his strongholds against the Pope himself.

Cœlestine III. during the rest of his pontificate maintained the high Christian ground, not indeed of mediator between the rivals for the kingdom of Apulia, but as protector of the distressed, the deliverer of the captive. Tancred, Count of Lecce, had been raised by the influence of the chancellor, Matthew of Salerno, to the throne of Sicily; the whole island had trembled at the chancellor's admonitions on the dangers of submission to a foreign yoke. Tancred, undisputed sovereign of Sicily, made rapid progress in the conquest of the kingdom of Naples. The Emperor Henry, after some

<sup>i</sup> "Hi acceptæ legatione Imperatoris incantam civitatem Romanis tradiderunt qui multos peremerunt de civibus, et fere omnes sive pedibus, sive manibus, seu aliis membris muti- laverunt. Pro qua re Imperatori improperatum est multis."—Urspergen. in Chron. Sicardus Cremonen. in Chron. apud Murator. Script. Ital. vol. vii.

successes, had been baffled by the obstinate resistance of Naples; sickness had weakened his forces; he was obliged to retire to Germany. He had entrusted his Queen Constantia to the inhabitants of Salerno, who had won his confidence by loud protestations of loyalty. But there was a strong Norman party in Salerno; Constantia was delivered as a prisoner into the hands of Tancred. Cœlestine interposed. The influence of the Pope, the generous chivalry of his own disposition, or perhaps the fear that the presence and misfortunes of Constantia might awaken the sympathy of his own subjects, induced Tancred to send her to the Emperor, not merely without ransom but loaded with magnificent presents.

For another prisoner was implored the interposition of the Pope. King Richard of England had been seized, on his return from the Holy Land, Imprisonment of King Richard. by his deadly enemy Duke Leopold of Austria. The Emperor had compelled or bribed his surrender; he was now in a dungeon of the castle of Trefels. No sooner had the news of his capture reached his own dominions than the Archbishop of Rouen wrote to complain of this outrage against a king and a crusader, who as a crusader was under the special protection of the Holy See—"Unsheath at once, most merciful father, the sword of St. Peter; show at once your debt of gratitude to such a son of the Church, that even those of lower rank may know what succour they may expect from you in their hour of necessity." Peter of Blois, the Archdeacon of Bath, whose high reputation for letters justified the step, addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Mentz, requiring his good offices and those of the whole German clergy for the deliverance of the King. He scrupled not, in his zeal, to compare the

Duke of Austria and the Emperor himself to Judas Iscariot, who sold the Lord, and as deserving the fate of Judas.<sup>k</sup> Eleanor the Queen Mother addressed the Pope, letter after letter, in the most vehement and impas-  
Letters of  
Queen  
Eleanor. sioned language<sup>m</sup>—“On thee will fall all the guilt of this tragedy: thou who art the father of orphans, the judge of widows, the comforter of those that mourn and weep, the city of refuge to all. If the Church of Rome sits silent with folded hands at such an outrage against Christ, let God arise and judge our cause. . . . Where is the zeal of Elijah against Ahab? the zeal of John against Herod? the zeal of Ambrose against Valens? the zeal of Alexander III., whom we have heard and seen awfully cutting off Frederick the father of this Prince from the communion of the faithful?” The supplication, the expostulations, became more and more bitter. “For trifling causes your cardinals are sent in all their power even to the most barbarous regions; in this arduous, in this lamentable, in this common cause, you have not appointed even a subdeacon or an acolyth. It is lucre which in our day commissions legates, not respect for Christ, not the honour of the Church, not the peace of kingdoms, not the salvation of the people. . . . You would not much have debased the dignity of the Roman See, if in your own person you had set out to Germany for the deliverance of so great a King. Restore me my son; O man of God, if thou art indeed a man of God, not a man of

<sup>k</sup> Petri Blesensis, Epist. 64.

<sup>m</sup> Petri Blesensis, Epist. 143, 144, 145, 146. These letters were written, it should seem, by Peter of Blois, with his usual force, his occasional felicity, his occasional pedantry of scriptural illus-

tration, his play upon words. “Nobis in germania Germania haec mala germinat universis. Legati nobis janc testes promissi sunt, nec sunt missi: utque verum futear, ligati potius quam legati.”

blood ! if thou art so lukewarm in his deliverance, the Most High may require his blood at thy hands." She dwells on the great services of the Kings of England, of Henry II. to the See of Rome : his influence had retained the King of France in fidelity to Alexander, his wealth had bought the obedience of the Romans. In a second, in a third letter, she is more pressing, more pathetic—" Can your soul be safe while you do not earnestly endeavour the deliverance of your son, the sheep of your fold, by frequent legations, by wholesome admonitions, by the thunders of commination, by general interdicts, by awful excommunications ? You ought to lay down your life for him in whose behalf you are unwilling to speak or to write a single word." Cœlestine was unmoved by entreaties, remonstrances, rebukes. The promised legates never presented themselves so long as Richard was in prison.<sup>n</sup> It appears not whether from prudence or fear, but no sooner was the King released, than Cœlestine embraced his cause with ardour : he demanded the restitution of the ransom, the deliverance of the hostages. He excommunicated Duke Leopold of Austria and all who had been concerned in the imprisonment of Richard. The Duke of Austria, at length, being in danger of his life by a fall from his horse, was glad to purchase his release from the excommunication by obedience to the Pope's demands.

By the death of Tancred King of Sicily, and of Roger the heir of Tancred (he died, it was said, of grief for the loss of his son), and the rapid reconquest of Apulia, and even of Sicily itself, by the Emperor Henry, the Empire had again consolidated its strength. The realm of the Hohenstaufens extended from the Mediterranean

---

<sup>n</sup> Richard imprisoned, Dec. 20, 1192; released Feb. 1194.

to the Baltic. It might seem that the coming century, instead of beholding the Pope, after years of obstinate strife with the house of Swabia, at the culminating point of his power, and seeing the last blood of the Hohenstaufens flow upon the scaffold, might behold him sunk into a vassal of the Emperor. It might seem that, enclosed and cooped in on every side, holding even spiritual communications with Christendom only by the permission of the German, the Pontiff might perhaps be compelled to yield up all the haughty pretensions of the Church under long, weary, irremediable, degrading oppression. Powers which he dared not wield, or wielded in vain, would fall into contempt; the Emperor would create Popes according to his own will, and Popes so created, having lost their independence, would lose their self-respect and the respect of mankind.

But Henry himself, by the curse which, without penetrating into the divine counsels, he may be supposed to have entailed on his race by his atrocious cruelties in Italy, by the universal execration which he brought on the German name and the Ghibelline cause, by tyranny which, after much allowance for the exaggeration of hate, is too strongly, too generally attested, contributed more, perhaps, than has been generally supposed, to the sudden growth of the Papal power.

Henry appeared in Italy: Pisa and Genoa forgot their hostilities to join their fleets in his support. Pope Coelestine bowed before the storm. Though Henry had neither restored the English gold nor the hostages, though he still retained possession of the lands of the Countess Matilda, and was virtually under excommunication as participant in the guilt of Richard's captivity, the Pope ventured on no measure

The Emperor Henry  
In Italy.

of resistance, and Henry passed contemptuously by Rome to his southern prey. The Apulian cities opened their gates ; Salerno only, in the desperation of fear for her treachery to the Empress, made some resistance, and suffered accordingly.<sup>o</sup> Henry marched without further opposition from the Garigliano to the Straits of Messina, from Messina to Palermo. Palermo received him with open gates, with clouds of incense and joyous processions. The youthful William, the second son of Tancred, laid his crown at the feet of the Emperor, and received the hereditary Countship of Lecce.

The campaign began in August ; the Emperor celebrated Christmas in Palermo A.D. 1194. There had been no sound of arms, no disturbance, except from the jealousy of the Pisans and Genoese : not a drop of blood had been shed. At Christmas, the period of peace and festivity, Henry laid before a great assembly of the realm letters (it was said forged)<sup>p</sup> but letters which even if they did not reveal, were declared to reveal, an extensive conspiracy against his power. Bishops, nobles, the royal family, were implicated in the charges. No further evidence was offered or required. Peter de Celano sat as supreme justiciary, a man dear to the hard and ruthless heart of Henry. A judicial massacre began. Archbishops and bishops, counts and nobles—

<sup>o</sup> The eloquent Hugo Falcandus saw the coming ruin. “ Intueri mihi jam videor turbulentas barbarorum acies, et quo feruntur impetu irruentes, civitates opulentas, et loca diuturnâ pace florentia metu concutere, cœde vastare, rapinis atterere et fœdere luxuriâ. . . . Nec enim aut rationis ordine regi, aut miseratione deflecti, aut religione terreri Teutonica novit insania, quam et in natus furor exagitat et rapacitas stimu-

lat et libido præcipitat. . . . Væ tibi fons celebris et præclari nominis. Arethusa, quæ ad hanc devoluta es. miseriam, ut quæ poetarum solebas. carmina modulari, nunc Teutonicorum. ebrietatem mitiges, et eorum servias fœditati.” — Apud Murator. vii. p. 251.

<sup>p</sup> “ Literas ficticias et mendasas.” — Anon. Casin. Such were the Germans in Sicily. The French were to come

among them three sons of the Chancellor Matthew, Cruelties of Margantone the great naval captain, the Archbishop of Henry. bishop of Salerno—were apprehended, condemned, executed, or mutilated with barbarous variety of torture. Some were hanged, some buried alive, some burned; blinding and castration were the mildest punishments. The bodies of Tancred and his son were torn from their graves, the crowns plucked from their usurping brows. The Queen Sybilla, with her three daughters Aleria, Constantia, and Mardonia, Dec. 28, 1194. were thrown into prison; the young William blinded and mutilated.<sup>4</sup> On the very day when these fatal disclosures were made, and the work of blood began, the Empress Constantia gave birth at Jesi to Frederick Roger, afterwards the Emperor Frederick II. The Nemesis of Grecian tragedy might be imagined as presiding over the birth.

The Pope, in righteous indignation at these inhumanities, took courage, and issued the edict of excommunication against the Emperor. Excommunication, if reserved for such crimes, might have wrought more powerfully on the minds of men. But Henry was strong enough to treat such censures with disdain: he passed through Italy without condescending to notice Rome. As he passed he distributed to his faithful German followers territories, provinces, princedoms. Markwald obtained Ancona, Ravenna, and Romagna. Diephold had large lands in Apulia; at a later period he became Count of Ancona. Richard the Count of that city, the brother-in-law of Tancred, having been seized as a traitor, bound to the tail of a horse,

---

<sup>4</sup> The cruelties of Henry are darkly told, but not overcharged, in a recent work, *Charrier, Lutte des Papes et des Empereurs de la Maison de Suabe, Paris, 1846.* See, too, Von Raumer, *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen*, b. vi c. iii.

dragged through the streets of Capua, was hung up by the leg, till the Emperor's fool, after two days' misery, put an end to his pain by tying a great stone to his neck. Philip, the Emperor's brother, had the domains of the Countess Matilda and all Tuscany. Philip married Irene, daughter of the Byzantine Emperor and widow of King Roger of Sicily. Not yet thirty years old, Henry VI., the Hohenstaufen, absolute master of Germany and of Italy, was at a greater height of power than had been attained by his father Barbarossa, or was subsequently reached by Frederick II. He could defy another Lombard League which was forming to control him; the feuds in Germany broke not out into open war. His proposition to make the Empire hereditary in his family, on the attractive condition that he should guarantee the hereditary descent of the great fiefs, and abandon all claims on the estates of the Church, was heard with favour, and accepted by fifty-two princes of the empire. The great ecclesiastics were not indisposed to the measure; even the Pope hesitated, and only on mature deliberation declared himself opposed to the plan. But the election of his son Frederick as King of the Romans was acceded to by his brothers, by all the princes, and won the reluctant consent of Albert Archbishop of Mentz. His popularity in Germany was increased by his earnest support of a new crusade, to which the death of Saladin and the feuds among his sons might give some reasonable hopes of success. Henry did not venture to withdraw his own personal presence from his European dominions; but he was liberal in his influence, in his levies, and in his contributions to the holy cause. The only opposition to Henry's despotism was that of the gentler Empress, who tem.  
A.D. 1195.  
A.D. 1196.

pered by every means in her power the inhuman tyranny  
 Queen Con- which still crushed her Sicilian subjects to  
 stance. the earth. So distasteful was her mildness, it was rumoured abroad, that it gave rise to serious dissensions between the husband and the wife, that she had even meditated an insurrection in favour of her depressed people, and the transfer of her kingdom and of her hand to some less tyrannic sovereign. But these were doubtless the fictions of those who hoped they might be true: there was no outward breach; nothing seemed to disturb the conjugal harmony.

Henry returned to his Italian dominions, to suppress in his own person all that threatened insurrection, or which might by its strength be tempted to insurrection. He levelled the walls of Capua and Naples. He crossed to Sicily, and sat down before the insignificant castle of St. John, the chieftain of which had been driven into rebellion by the fear of being treated as a rebel. On a hot autumn day he went out to hunt in the neighbouring forest, drank copiously of cold water, and exposed

<sup>Death of</sup> Henry. himself to the chill dews of the evening. A fever came on; he was with difficulty removed to Messina, and died in the arms of his wife. His son Frederick had not yet completed his second year. As soon as the Pope could be prevailed on to remove the excommunication, Henry VI. was buried in great state at Palermo.<sup>r</sup> Three months after Coelestine III. followed him to the grave.<sup>s</sup> An infant was the heir of the Empire; Innocent III., in the prime of life, was Pope.

\* Henry died Sept. 28, 1197.

\* Coelestine died Jan. 8, 1198.

## BOOK IX.

## CHRONOLOGY OF INNOCENT III.

POPES.	EMPERORS.		KING OF FRANCE.		KINGS OF ENGLAND.		KINGS OF DENMARK.		EMPERORS OF THE EAST.	
	A.D. 1198 Innocent III.	A.D. 1216 Philip II.	A.D. 1208	A.D. 1180 Philip Augustus	A.D. 1223	A.D. Richard I.	A.D. 1029	Cantus VI.	A.D. 1202	Alexius III.
	1208 Otto IV.	1218				1029 John	1216	1202 Waldemar II.	1241	Isaac Mourzilfe
	1212 Frederick II.									<i>Latin.</i>
KING OF NAPLES.		KING OF HUNGARY.		ARCHBISHOPS OF RHEIMS.		ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.		KINGS OF SPAIN.		
1197 Frederick II.	1231	Enrico	1204	William	1202	Hilbert	1203	<i>Castile.</i>		
		1234 Ladislaus	1206	1205 Guy	1256	1297 Stephen Langton		Alfonso III.	1214	
			1235 Andrew II.	1235	1207 Alberic			1214 Henry I.	1217	
ARCHBISHOPS OF MILAN.		ARCHBISHOPS OF MENTZ.		COUNCIL OF VITTEBACH		<i>Arragon.</i>		1196 Peirz II.	1213	
1196 Philip de Campagnano	1206	1204 Uberto Paruzzo	1211	1200 Siegfried of Eppstein				1219 James I.		
1211 Enrico di Spagna	1220	1211 Gerard de Sessa	1211	1250						

## BOOK IX.

## INNOCENT III.



## CHAPTER I.

Rome and Italy.

**U**NDER Innocent III., the Papal power rose to its <sup>The Papal</sup> ~~utmost height.~~ Later Pontiffs, more especially Boniface VIII., were more exorbitant in their pretensions, more violent in their measures; but the full sovereignty of the Popedom had already taken possession of the minds of the Popes themselves, and had been submitted to by great part of Christendom. The thirteenth century is nearly commensurate with this supremacy of the Pope. Innocent III. at its commencement calmly exercised as his right, and handed down strengthened and almost irresistible to his successors, that which, at its close, Boniface asserted with repulsive and ill-timed arrogance, endangered, undermined, and shook to its base. At least from the days of Hildebrand, the mind of Europe had become familiarised with the assertion of those claims, which in their latent significance amounted to an absolute irresponsible autocracy. The essential inherent supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power, as of the soul over the body, as of eternity over time, as of Christ over Cæsar, as of God over man, was now an integral part of Christianity. There was a shuddering sense of impiety

in all resistance to this ever-present rule ; it required either the utmost strength of mind, desperate courage, or desperate recklessness, to confront the fatal and undefined consequences of such resistance. The assertion of these powers by the Church had been, however intermittently, yet constantly growing, and had now fully grown into determinate acts. The Popes had not merely claimed, they had established many precedents of their right to excommunicate sovereigns, and so of virtually releasing subjects from their allegiance to a king under sentence of outlawry ; to call sovereigns to account not merely for flagrant outrages on the Church, but for moral delinquencies,\* especially those connected with marriage and concubinage ; to receive kingdoms by the cession of their sovereigns as feudal fiefs ; to grant kingdoms which had no legitimate lord, or of which the lordship was doubtful and contested, or such as were conquered from infidels, barbarians, or heretics : as to the Empire, to interfere in the election as judge both in the first and last resort. Ideas obtain authority and dominion, not altogether from their intrinsic truth, but rather from their constant asseveration, especially when they fall in with the common hopes and fears, the wants and necessities of human nature. The mass of mankind have neither leisure nor ability to examine them ; they fatigue, and so compel the world into their

\* Innocent III. lays this down broadly and distinctly : "Cum enim non humanæ constitutioni sed divinæ potius initiamur : quia potestus nostra non ex homine sed ex Deo ; nullus qui sit sanæ mentis ignorat, quin ad officium nostrum spectet de quounque mortali peccato corrigere quemlibet Christianum, et si correctionem contempserit,

ipsum per distinctionem ecclesiasticam coercere."—Decret. Innocent. III., sub ann. 1200, cap. 13, de Judiciis. Eichhorn observes on this : "Womit denn natürlich der Grundsatz selbst, das die Kirche wegen Sündlichkeit der Handlung über jede Civilsache erkennen möge, anerkannt wurde."—Rechts-Geschichte, ii. 517.

acceptance; more particularly if it is the duty, the passion, and the interest of one great associated body to perpetuate them, while it is neither the peculiar function, nor the manifest advantage of any large class or order to refute them. The Pope had, throughout the strife, an organised body of allies in the camp of the enemy; the King or Emperor none, at least none below the nobles, who would not have preferred the triumph of the spiritual power. If such ideas are favoured by ambiguity of language, their progress is more sure, their extirpation from the mind of man infinitely more difficult. The Latin clergy had been busy for many centuries in asserting, under the specious name of their liberty, the supremacy of the Church which was their own supremacy; for several centuries in asserting the autocracy of the Pope as Head of the Church. This, which was true, at least on the acknowledged principles of the time, in a certain degree, was easily extended to its utmost limits; and when it had become part of the habitual belief, it required some palpable abuse, some startling oppugnancy to the common sense of mankind, to awaken suspicion, to rouse the mind to the consideration of its groundwork, and to decompose the splendid fallacy.

Splendid indeed it was, as harmonising with man's natural sentiment of order. The unity of the vast Christian republic was an imposing conception, which, even now that history has shown its hopeless impossibility, still infatuates lofty minds; its impossibility, since it demands for its Head not merely that infallibility in doctrine so boldly claimed in later times, but absolute impeccability in every one of its possessors; more than impeccability, an all-commanding, indefeasible, unquestionable majesty of virtue, holiness, and

wisdom. Without this it is a baseless tyranny, a senseless usurpation. In those days it struck in with the whole feudal system, which was one of strict gradation and subordination; to the hierarchy of Church and State was equally wanting the Crown, the Sovereign Liege Lord.<sup>b</sup>

When this idea was first promulgated in all its naked sternness by Gregory VII., it had come into collision with other ideas rooted with almost equal depth in the mind of man, that especially of the illimitable Cæsarean power, which though transferred to a German Emperor, was still a powerful tradition, and derived great weight from its descent through Charlemagne. But the imperial power, from its elective character; from the strife and intrigue at each successive election; from constant contests for the imperial crown; from the opposition of mighty houses, one or two of which were almost always nearly equal in wealth and influence to the Emperor; from the weaknesses, vices, tyrannies of the Emperors themselves, had been more and more impaired; that of the Pope, notwithstanding transient obscurations, had been silently ascending to still higher estimation. The humiliation of the Emperor was degradation; it brought contempt on the office, scarcely redeemed by the abilities, successes, or even virtues of new Sovereigns; the humiliation of the Pope was a noble suffering in the cause of God and truth, the depression of patient holiness under worldly violence. In every schism the

<sup>b</sup> A letter of Innocent to the Consuls of Milan declares that it is sacrilege to doubt the decrees of a Pope; that though he is born of sinners, of a sinful race, yet, since he fills the place of him that was without sin, he who despises

him despises Christ. The cause of dispute was the excommunication of Passaguerra, against which the Milanese protested as unjust. Compare the Decretalia, ii. and iii., on the superiority of the priesthood to the temporal power.

Pope who maintained the loftiest Churchmanship had eventually gained the superiority, the Imperialising Popes had sunk into impotence, obscurity, ignominy.

The Crusades had made the Pope not merely the spiritual, but in some sort the military suzerain of Europe ; he had the power of summoning all Christendom to his banner ; the raising the cross, the standard of the Pope, was throughout Europe a general and compulsory levy, the *herr-ban* of all who bore arms, of all who could follow an army. That which was a noble act of devotion had become a duty : not to assume the cross was sin and impiety. The Crusades thus became a kind of forlorn hope upon which all the more dangerous and refractory of the temporal sovereigns might be employed, so as to waste their strength, if not lose their lives, by the accidents of the journey or by the sword of the Mohammedan. If they resisted, the fearful excommunication hung over them, and was ratified by the fears and by the wavering allegiance of their subjects. If they obeyed and returned, as most of them did, with shame and defeat, they returned shorn of their power, lowered in the public estimation, and perhaps till pursued, on account of their ill success, with the inexorable interdict. It was thus by trammelling their adversaries with vows which they could not decline, and from which they could not extricate themselves ; by thus consuming their wealth and resources on this wild and remote warfare, that the Popes, who themselves decently eluded, or were prevented by age or alleged occupations from embarkation in these adventurous expeditions, broke and wasted away the power and influence of the Emperors. Conrad the first Hohenstaufen had betrayed prudent reluctance to march away from distracted Germany to the Holy Land. St. Bernard

sternly demanded how he would answer at the great day of Judgement, the dereliction of this more manifest duty. The trembling Emperor acknowledged the voice of God, girt on the cross, collected the strength of the Empire, to leave their whitening bones on the plains and in the defiles of Asia Minor; he returned to Europe discomfited and fallen in the estimation of all Christendom. Frederick Barbarossa, the greatest of the Swabian house, had perished in the zenith of his power, in a small remote river in Asia Minor. During this century will appear Frederick II., probably in his heart, at least during his riper years, disdaining the enthusiasm with which the dominant feeling of the time forced him to comply, excommunicated for not taking the cross, excommunicated for not setting out to the Holy Land, excommunicated for setting out, excommunicated in the Holy Land, excommunicated for returning after having made an advantageous peace with the Mohammedans. During his whole reign he is vainly struggling to burst the fetters thus wound around him, and riveted not merely by the remorseless hostility of his spiritual antagonists, but by the irresistible sentiment of the age. On this subject there was no assumption, no abuse of Papal authority, which was not ratified by the trembling assent of Christendom. The Crusades, too, had now made the Western world tributary to the Popedom the vast subventions raised for the Holy Land were to a certain extent at the disposal of the Pope. The taxation of the clergy on his authority could not be refused for such an object; a tenth of all the exorbitant wealth of the hierarchy passed through his hands. An immense financial system grew up; Papal collectors were in every land, Papal bankers in every capital, to transmit these subsidies. The enormous increase of his

power from this source may be conjectured ; the abuses of that power, the emoluments for dispensations from vows, and other evils, will appear in the course of our history.

But, after all, none of these accessory and, in some degree, fortuitous aids could have raised the Papal authority to its commanding height,<sup>c</sup> had it not possessed more sublime and more lawful claims to the reverence of mankind. It was still an assertion of eternal principles of justice, righteousness, and humanity. However it might trample on all justice, sacrifice righteousness to its own interests, plunge Europe in desolating wars, perpetuate strife in states, set sons in arms against their fathers, fathers against sons ; it was still proclaiming a higher ultimate end. It was something that there was a tribunal of appeal, before which the lawless kings, the lawless feudal aristocracy trembled, however that tribunal might be proverbial for its venality and corruption, and constantly warped in its judgements by worldly interests. There was a perpetual provocation, as it were, to the Gospel, which gave hope where it did not give succour ; which might, and frequently did, offer a refuge against overwhelming tyranny ; something, which in itself rebuked rugged force, and inspired some restraint on heinous immorality.

<sup>c</sup> It may be well to state the chief points which the Pope claimed as his exclusive prerogative :—

I. General supremacy of jurisdiction ; a claim, it is obvious, absolutely illimitable.

II. Right of legislation, including the summoning and presiding in Councils.

III. Judgement in all ecclesiastic causes arduous and difficult. This included the power of judging on con-

tested elections, and degrading bishops, a super-metropolitan power.

IV. Right of confirmation of bishops and metropolitans, the gift of the pallium. Hence, by degrees, rights of appointment to devolved sees, reservations, &c.

V. Dispensations.

VI. The foundation of new orders.

VII. Canonisation.

Compare Eichhorn, ii. p. 500.

The Papal language, the language of the clergy, was still ostentatiously, profoundly religious; it professed, even if itself did not always respect, even though it tampered with, the awful sense of retribution before an all-knowing, all righteous God. In his highest pride, the Pope was still the servant of the servants of God; in all his cruelty he boasted of his kindness to the transgressor; every contumacious Emperor was a disobedient son; the excommunication was the voice of a parent, who affected at least reluctance to chastise. Every Pope declared, no doubt imagined, himself the vicar and representative of Christ, and it was impossible that all the darkness which had gathered around the perfect humanity, the God in man as revealed in the Gospel, could entirely obscure all its exquisite truth, holiness, and love.

If this great Idea was ever to be realised of a Christian republic with a Pope at its head—and that a Pope of a high Christian character (in some respects, in all perhaps but one, in tolerance and gentleness almost impossible in his days, and the want of which, far from impairing, confirmed his strength)—none could bring more lofty, more various qualifications for its accomplishment, none could fall on more favourable times than Innocent III. Innocent was an Italian of noble birth, but not of a family inextricably involved in the petty quarrels and interests of the Prinedoms of Romagna. He was of the Conti,<sup>4</sup> who derived their name in some remote time from their dignity. His father, Count Trasimondo of Segna (the name Trasimondo was traced to the Lombard Dukes of Spoleto,

<sup>4</sup> The Conti family boasted of nine Popes,—among them Innocent III., Gregory IX., Alexander IV., Innocent XIII.; of thirteen cardinals, according to Ciacconius.

if truly, it implied Teutonic blood), married Claricia, of the senatorial house of Scotti. He was a Roman, therefore, by the mother's side, probably of a kindred attached to the liberties of the city. Lothair was the youngest of four brothers, born at Anagni. He had high ecclesiastical connexions, both on his father's and his mother's side. John, the famous Cardinal of St. Mark, was his paternal uncle. Paul, the Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina, by the title of St. Sergius and St. Bacchus, afterwards Pope Clement III., probably his uncle on his mother's side. The Cardinal Octavian, the firmest, ablest, and most intrepid supporter of Alexander III., was of his kindred.

All these were of the high anti-  
*Education.* Imperialist faction.

The early education of Lothair, at Rome, was completed by some years of study at Paris, the great school of theology; and at Bologna, that of law. He returned to Rome with the highest character for erudition and for irreproachable manners; he became a Canon of St. Peter's. The elevation of his uncle, the Cardinal of St. Sergius and St. Bacchus, to the Pontificate as Clement III., paved the way to his

*Cardinalate.* rapid rise. He was elevated in his twenty-

ninth year to the Cardinalate under the title vacated by his uncle. Already he was esteemed among the ablest and most judicious counsellors of the supreme Pontiff. The successor of Clement III., Cœlestine III., was of the house of Orsini, between whom and the maternal ancestors of Lothair, the Scotti, to whom Clement III. his patron belonged, was an ancient, unreconciled feud. Cœlestine III.,\* very much advanced in years, might suspect the nepotism of his predecessor, which had raised his kinsman to such almost un-

\* Cœlestine was of the house of Bobo, a branch of the Orsini.

precedent rank, and had entrusted him with affairs so far beyond his years. During Cœlestine's Popedom, the Cardinal Lothair either withdrew or was silently repelled from the prominent place which he had filled under the Pontificate of Clement. In his retirement he began to despise the ungrateful world, and wrote his treatise on "Contempt of the world and the misery of human life." The stern monastic energy of language throughout this treatise displays in another form the strength of Innocent's character: had he remained in seclusion he might have founded an order more severe than that of Benedict, as active as those which he was destined to sanction, the Dominicans and Franciscans. But he was to show his contempt of the world not by renouncing but by ruling it.<sup>f</sup>

Cœlestine on his death-bed had endeavoured to nominate his successor: he had offered to resign the Papacy if the Cardinals would elect John of Colonna. But, even if consistent with right and with usage, the words of dying sovereigns rarely take effect. Of twenty-eight Cardinals,<sup>g</sup> five only were absent; of the rest the unanimous vote fell on the youngest of their body, on the Cardinal Lothair. No irregularity impaired the autho-

<sup>f</sup> This work, written in not inelegant Latin, is monastic to its core. It asserts the Augustinian notion of the transmission of original sin with repulsive nakedness. Nothing can be baser or more miserable than human nature thus propagated. I cannot help quoting a strange passage: "Onnes nascimur ejulantes ut nostram miseriam exprimamus. Masculus enim recenter natus dicit A, fæmina 'E, quotquot nascuntur ab Eva.' Quid est igitur Eva nisi heu ha! Utrumque dolentis

est interjectio, doloris exprimens magnitudinem?"—i. 3. This puerility does not contrast more strongly with the practical wisdom of Innocent, than sentences like this with his haughtiness: "O superba præsumptio, et præsumptuosa superbia! quæ non tantum Angelos Deo voluisti adæquare, sed etiam homines præsumpsisti deificare." ii. c. 92.

<sup>g</sup> The list in Ciacconius, vol. ii. p. 2. Hurter, Leben Innocent III., i. 78, gives the names of the absentees.

rity of his election ; there was no murmur of opposition or schism : the general suffrage of the clergy and the people of Rome was confirmed by the unhesitating assent of Christendom. The death of the Emperor, the infancy of his son, the state of affairs in Germany, made all secure on the side of the Empire. Lothair was only thirty-seven years old, almost an unprecedented age for a Pope ;<sup>h</sup> even a mind like his might tremble at this sudden elevation. He was as yet but in deacon's orders ; he had to accumulate those of priest, bishop, and so become Pope. It may be difficult in some cases to dismiss all suspicion of hypocrisy, when men who have steadily held the Papacy before them as the object of their ambition, have affected to decline the tiara, and played off a graceful and yielding resistance. But the strength, as well as the deep religious seriousness of Lothair's character, might make him naturally shrink from the assumption of such a dignity at an age almost without example ; and in times if favourable to the aggrandisement of the Papacy, therefore of more awful responsibility. The Cardinals who proclaimed him saluted him by the name of Innocent, in testimony of his blameless life. In his inauguration sermon broke forth the character of the man ; the unmeasured assertion of his dignity, protestations of humility which have a sound of pride. "Ye see what manner of servant that is whom the Lord hath set over his people ; no other than the vicegerent of Christ ; the successor of Peter. He stands in the midst between God and man ; below God, above

<sup>h</sup> Walter der Vogelweide, who attributes all the misery of the civil war in Germany to Innocent, closes his poem with these words (modernised by K. Simrock) :—

"Ich hörte fern in einer Klaus  
Ein jammern ohne Ende:  
Ein Klauauer rang die Hände;  
Er klagte Gott sein bittres Leid;  
O weh, der Papst ist allzu jung, Herr Gott,  
küßt deiner Christenheit."  
—Simrock, p. 175.

man; less than God, more than man. He judges all, is judged by none, for it is written—‘I will judge.’ But he whom the pre-eminence of dignity exalts, is lowered by his office of a servant, that so humility may be exalted, and pride abased; for God is against the high-minded, and to the lowly he shows mercy; and he who exalteth himself shall be abased. Every valley shall be lifted up, every hill and mountain laid low!” The letters in which he announced his election to the king of France, and to the other realms of Christendom, blend a decent but exaggerated humility with the consciousness of power: Innocent’s confidence in himself transpires through his confidence in the divine protection.<sup>1</sup>

The state of Christendom might have tempted a less ambitious prelate to extend and consolidate <sup>State of</sup> Christendom. his supremacy. At no period in the history of the Papacy could the boldest assertion of the spiritual power, or even the most daring usurpation, so easily have disguised itself to the loftiest mind under the sense of duty to God and to mankind; never was season so favourable for the aggrandisement of the Pope, never could his aggrandisement appear a greater blessing to the world. Wherever Innocent cast his eyes over Christendom and beyond the limits of Christendom, appeared disorder, contested thrones, sovereigns oppressing their subjects, subjects in arms against their sovereigns, the ruin of the Christian cause. In Italy the crown of Naples on the brows of an infant; the fairest provinces under the galling yoke of fierce German adventurers; the Lombard republics, Guelf or Ghibelline, at war within their walls, at war or in implacable animosity against each other; the Empire

<sup>1</sup> Epist. i. 1, et seqq.

distracted by rival claimants for the throne, one vast scene of battle, intrigue, almost of anarchy; the tyrannical and dissolute Philip Augustus King of France, before long the tyrannical and feeble John of England. The Byzantine empire is tottering to its fall; the kingdom of Jerusalem confined almost to the city of Acre. Every realm seemed to demand, or at least to invite, the interposition, the mediation, of the head of Christendom; in every land one party at least, or one portion of society, would welcome his interference in the last resort for refuge or for protection. Nor did Innocent shrink from that which might have crushed a less energetic spirit to despair; from the Jordan to the Atlantic, from the Mediterranean to beyond the Baltic his influence is felt and confessed; his vast correspondence shows at once the inexhaustible activity of his mind; he is involved simultaneously or successively in the vital interests of every kingdom in the western world. The history of Innocent's Papacy will be more full and intelligible by tracing his acts in succession rather than in strict chronological order, in every part of Christendom.

I. In Rome, and II. In Italy. III. In the Empire. IV. In France. V. In England. VI. In Spain. VII. In the Northern kingdoms. VIII. In Bulgaria and Hungary. IX. In the Byzantine Empire and the East, in Constantinople, Armenia, and the Holy Land. Finally, X. In the wars of Languedoc with the Albigensian and other schismatics; and XI. XII. In the establishment of the two new monastic orders, that of St. Dominic and that of St. Francis.

The affairs of Rome and of Italy are so intimately blended that it may not be convenient to keep them entirely disconnected.

I The city of Rome was the first to acknowledge the

ascendancy of the new Pontiff. Since the treaty with Clement III. the turbulence of the Roman people seemed sunk to rest. As well the stirring reminiscences of their ancient grandeur as the democratic Christianity of Arnold of Brescia were forgotten. The mutinous spirit which had twice risen in insurrection against Lucius III., and had driven that Pontiff into the north of Italy, had been allayed.<sup>k</sup> Clement had appeased them for a time by the promise of sacrificing Tusculum to their implacable hostility; his successor Cœlestine III. had consummated or extorted from the Emperor that sacrifice.<sup>m</sup> A judicious payment distributed by Clement among the senators had reconciled them to the Papal supremacy. The great Roman families, though their private feuds were not even suspended, were allied to the church by the promotion of their ecclesiastical members to the Cardinals.<sup>n</sup> The Roman aristocracy had furnished many names among the twenty-seven who concurred in the elevation of the Roman Lothair. Innocent pursued the policy of Clement III. The usual largess on the accession of the new Pope was silently and skilfully distributed through the thirteen quarters of the city. The prefect of the city, now the representative of the imperial authority (the empire was in abeyance), was either overawed or won to take a strong oath of allegiance to the Pope,<sup>o</sup> by which the sovereignty of the Emperor was silently abrogated. Innocent substituted his own Justiciaries for those appointed by the senate: the

<sup>k</sup> See vol. iii. p. 147.

<sup>m</sup> See vol. iii. p. 158.

<sup>n</sup> In Innocent's earlier promotions I observe a Brancaleone, a Pierleoni (qu. Peter Leonis), a Bisontio from Orvieto,

a Crescentius, besides several connected with the Conti.—Additions to Ciacconius.

<sup>o</sup> Gesta, viii. Epist. 1, 23, 577, 578. The oath of Peter the Prefect, i. 577.

whole authority emanated from the Pope, and was held during his pleasure; to the Pope alone the judges were responsible; they were bound to resign when called upon by him. In his own spiritual courts Innocent endeavoured to set the example of strict and unbought justice; to remove the inveterate reproach of venality, which withheld the concourse of appellants to Rome, and was so far injurious to the people. He severely limited the fees and emoluments of his officers; three times a week he held a public consistory for smaller causes; the gravest he meditated in private, and the most accomplished canon lawyer might acquire knowledge from the decrees drawn up by Innocent himself. Even the commencement of Innocent's reign shows how the whole Christian world paid its tribute of appeal to Rome.<sup>P</sup> There was one cause concerning the jurisdiction of the sees of Braga and Compostella over great part of Spain and Portugal; a cause for the metropolitanate of Brittany between the Bishops of Tours and Dôle; a cause of the Archbishop of Canterbury concerning the parish of Lambeth.

Yet neither could the awe, nor the dexterous management of Innocent, nor the wealth of the tributary world, subdue or bribe refractory Rome to peace. There were still factious nobles, John Rainer, one of the Peter Leonis, and John Capocio, a man of stirring popular eloquence, who endeavoured to excite the people to reclaim their rights. Still the versatile people listened with greedy ears to these republican tenets. Still the Orsini were in deadly feud with the Scotti, the maternal house of

---

<sup>P</sup> Under the Lateran palace, near the kitchen, was a change of money, in which the coin of various countries, vessels of gold and silver were heaped up, exchanged, or sold, by the prætors, for the expenses of the Curia. These "tables of the money-changers" Innocent abolished at once.—*Gesta, xli.*

the Pope. Still were there outbursts of insurrection in the turbulent city; still outbursts of war in the no less turbulent territory; Rome was at war with her neighbours, her neighbours with each other. <sup>A.D. 1200</sup> Ere three years of Innocent's reign had passed, Rome, in defence of Viterclano, besieged by the Viterbans, takes up arms against Viterbo.

The Romans cared not for the liberty of Viterclano, but they had old arrears of hatred against Viterbo; and once the waters troubled, their gain was sure.<sup>q</sup> If the Pope was against them, Rome was against the Pope; if the Pope was on their side, Viterbo revolted from the Pope. The Tuscans moved to the aid of Viterbo; but the shrewd Pope, unexpectedly, on the pretext that the Viterbans had despised his commination, and even his excommunication, took the part of the Romans; a victory which they obtained over superior forces under the walls of Viterbo was attributed to his intercession; many of them renounced their hostility to the Pope.<sup>r</sup> A second time they marched out; they were supplied with money by the Pope's brother, Richard Count of Sora. While the Pope was celebrating mass on the holy Epiphany, they won a great victory,<sup>s</sup> <sup>A.D. 1201</sup> doubtless through the irresistible prayers of the Pope; it was reported that they brought home as trophies the great bell and the chains of one of the gates of Viterbo, which were long shown in Rome. The captive Viterbans, men of rank, were sent to Canaparia,

<sup>q</sup> "Quod non poterant in aquâ clarâ piscari, cœperunt aquam turbare." —*Gesta*, c. 133. October, 1200.

<sup>r</sup> "Quidam qui consueverant in contradictionem Domini Papæ ora laxare, publice dicerent, quod ita jam erant ipsorum linguae, quod nunquam de

cetero contra summum pontificem loquerentur." —*Gesta*, 133.

<sup>s</sup> This latter point rests on the authority of Ciacconius, who does not give his authority.—*Vit. Innocent. III.*, p. 8. The *Gesta* makes out clearly two battles.

where some of them died in misery. The most distinguished, Napoleon, Count of Campilia, and Burgudio, protonotary of Viterbo, the Pope afterwards, in compassion, kept in honourable custody in his own palace. Napoleon, to the indignation of the Romans, made his escape. The Pope even mediated a peace between Rome and Viterbo. Viterbo was humbled to the restoration of the brazen gates of the church of St. Peter, and set up again some brazen vessels in the porch, which she had borne away or broken in the days of Frederick Barbarossa.

The Pope had the strength to decide another quarrel by sterner measures. Two brothers, lords of Narni and Gabriano, were arraigned by Lando lord of Colmezzo and his brothers, for seizing some of their lands. The Pope commanded restitution. The lords of Narni and Gabriano pledged the lands to the Pope's turbulent adversaries in Rome, John Rainer, Peter Leoni, and John Capocio. The Pope instantly ordered the territories of Narni and Gabriano to be laid waste with fire and sword, suspended the common laws of war, sanctioned the ravaging their harvests, felling their fruit trees, destroying mills, driving away cattle. Innocent condescended or ventured to confront the popular leaders in the face of the people. He summoned a great congregation of the Romans, spoke with such commanding eloquence, that the menacing but abashed nobles were obliged to renounce the land which they had received in pawn, and to swear full obedience.<sup>t</sup>

Another year, and now the Orsini, the kindred of the late Pope Cœlestine, and the Scotti, the kindred of

---

<sup>t</sup> *Gesta, c. 134.* “Adhuc eis minantibus et resistantibus coegit nobiles antedictos, ut pignoris contractu re-

sciso, mandatis ipsius se per omnia parituros juramentis et si lejussionibus	promiserunt.”
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------

Pope Innocent, are in fierce strife. The Pope had retired for the summer to Velletri. He summoned both parties, and extorted an oath to keep the peace. The senator Pandulph de Suburra seized and destroyed a stronghold of the Orsini. Not many months elapsed, a murder was committed on the person of Tebaldo, a man connected with both families, by the sons of John Oddo, the Pope's cousin. The Orsini rose; they destroyed two towers belonging to the senator of Rome. They were hardly prevented from exposing the body under the windows of the palace of the Pope's brother, under those of the Pope himself. In the next year arises new strife on an affair of disputed property. The Pope is insulted during a solemn ceremonial. The Pope's adversaries make over the contested land to the senate and the people of Rome. The Pope protests, threatens in vain; the senator is besieged in the Capitol. The Pope finds it expedient to leave the rebellious city, he flies to Palestrina, to Ferentino, and passes the whole winter at Anagni. There he fell dangerously ill.

A.D. 1202.  
A.D. 1203.

Rome, impatient of his presence, grew weary of his absence. In the interval had broken out a new, a fiercer strife for a change in the constitution. It was proposed to abrogate the office of a single senator, and to elect by means of twelve middle men, a senate of fifty-six. The Pontiff returned amid universal acclamations. Yet Innocent so far yielded as to permit one of the Peter Leoni house to name the senator. He named Gregory, one of his kindred, a man well disposed to the Pope, but wanting in energy. Still the contest continued to rage, the eloquent Capocio to harangue the multitude. Above this anarchy is seen the calm and majestic Pope, who, as though weary of such petty

tumults, and intent on the greater affairs of the Pontificate, the humiliation of sovereigns, the reducing kingdoms to fiefs of the holy see, might seem, having quietly acquiesced in the senate of fifty-six, deliberately to have left the turbulent nobles, on one side the Orsinis, the Peter Leonis, the Capocios, the Baroncellis; on the other, the former senator Pandulph de Suburra, his own brother Count Richard, his kindred the Scotti, to vie with each other in building and strengthening their fortress palaces, and demolishing, whenever they were strong enough, those of their adversaries. To grant the wishes of the people of Rome was the certain way to disappoint them. Ere long they began to execrate the feeble rule of the fifty-six, and implored a single senator.<sup>1</sup> But throughout at least all the earlier years of his Pontificate, Innocent was content with less real power in Rome than in any other region of Christendom.

II. But on the accession of Innocent, beyond the city walls and the immediate territory, all which belonged to or was claimed by the Roman see was in the hands of ferocious German adventurers, at the head each of his predatory foreign troops. Markwald of Anweiler, a knight of Alsace, the Seneschal of the Emperor Henry, called himself Duke of Ravenna, and was invested with the March of Ancona and all its cities. Diephold, Count of Acerra, had large territories in Apulia. Conrad of Lutzenberg,<sup>2</sup> a Swabian knight, as Duke of Spoleto, possessed that city, its domain, and Assisi. The estates of the Countess Matilda were held by Germans in the

<sup>1</sup> "Unde populus adeo cœpit exercari, ut oportuerit Dominum Papam ad communem populi petitionem unum eis senatorem concedere." The last chapters of the *Gesta* are full of this

wild and confused anarchy.

<sup>2</sup> Conrad was called by the strange name Mück-in-hirn, "fly in his brain," (like our "bee in his bonnet") : he was the wildest of these wild soldiers,

name of Philip, the brother of the Emperor Henry, who had hastened to Germany to push his claims on the Empire. Some few cities had asserted their independence; the sea-coast and Salerno were occupied by Benedetto Carisomi. Of these Markwald was the most formidable; his congenial valour and cruelty had recommended him to the especial favour of Henry. He had been named by the Emperor on his deathbed Regent of Sicily.

Italy only awaited a deliverer from the German yoke. The annals of tyranny contain nothing more revolting than the cruelties of the Emperor Henry to his Italian subjects. While there was the profoundest sorrow in Germany at the loss of a monarch, if of severe justice, yet who, from his wisdom and valour, was compared with Solomon and David,<sup>x</sup> at his death the cry of rejoicing broke forth from Calabria to Lombardy. In asserting the papal claims to the dominion of Romagna, and all to which the See of Rome advanced its pretensions, Innocent fell in with all the more generous aspirations of Italy, with the common sympathies of mankind. The cause of the Guelfs (these names are now growing into common use) was more than that of the Church, it was the cause of freedom and humanity. The adherents of the Ghibellines, at least the open adherents (for in most cities there was a secret if small Ghibelline faction), were only the lords of the German

"*Omnia cum Papâ gaudent de morte  
tyranni . . .  
Mors necat et cuncti gaudent de morte  
sepulti,*  
*Apulus et Calaber, Siculus, Tuscusque  
Ligurque.*"—*J. de Ceccano, Chronic.*  
*Foss. Nov. Muratori, viii.*

\* "Cujus mors Teutonicorum omnium  
omnibusque Germaniae populis lamenta-  
tio lis est in æternum, quod aliorum  
dixitius eos claros reddidit, terroremque

eorum omnibus in circuitu nationibus  
per virtutem bellicam incussit, eosque  
præstantiores aliis gentibus nimium  
ostendit futuros, ui morte præventus  
foret. Per sapientiam Solomonis et  
per fortitudinem David regis acivit  
parcere subjectis et debellare superbos."  
Theodoric von Esternach. Martene,  
Coll. Amp. iv. 462.

fortresses, the cities they occupied and a few of the republics which dreaded the hostility of their neighbours more than a foreign yoke, Pisa, Cremona, Pavia, Genoa.

<sup>Markwald.</sup> The hour of deliverance, if not of revenge, was come. Innocent summoned Markwald to surrender the territories of the Church. Markwald was conscious of his danger, and endeavoured to lure the Pontiff into an alliance. He offered to make him greater than Pope had ever been since the days of Constantine.<sup>1</sup> But Innocent knew his strength in the universal, irresistible, indelible hatred of the foreign, the German, the barbarian yoke: he rejected the treacherous overtures.<sup>2</sup> City after city, Ancona, Fermo, Osimo, Fano, Sinigaglia, Pesaro, Iesi, dashed down the German banner; Camerina and Ascoli alone remained faithful to Markwald. Markwald revenged himself by sallying from the gates of Ravenna, ravaging the whole region, burning, plundering, destroying homesteads and harvests, castles and churches. Innocent opened the Papal treasures, borrowed large sums of money, raised an army; hurled an excommunication against the rebellious vassal of the Church, in which he absolved all who had sworn allegiance to Markwald from their oaths. Markwald withdrew into the south of Italy.

Conrad of Lutzenberg,<sup>3</sup> Duke of Spoleto, beheld the fall of Markwald with consternation; he made the

<sup>1</sup> "Se ecclesiam magis quam ulli imperatores auxissent, amplificaturum." —Otto de S. Blaise, c. 45; Rainald, sub ann. 1298.

<sup>2</sup> Epist. i. 38. "Licit autem dominus Papa conditionem istam utilem reputaret, quis tamen multi scandalisabantur ex ea tanquam vellet Teutonicos in Italia confore, qui crudeli tyrannide redegerant eos in gravissimam servitu-

tem, in favorem libertatis declinans, non acceptavit oblata." —Gesta, Innocent, c. 9. Boehmer (*Regesta*, p. vii.) quotes this, among other passages, to show the barbarity of the Germans, the hatred of the Italians.

<sup>3</sup> According to M. Abel (*Philip der Hohenstauffer*), properly Conrad of Urslingen.

humblest offers of subjection, the most liberal offers of tribute. But Innocent knew that any compromise with the Germans would be odious to his Italian subjects: he demanded instant, unconditional submission. Conrad surrendered all the patrimonial domains of the Pope in his possession without reserve; the other cities resumed their freedom. On these terms Innocent permitted the Cardinal Legate to receive at Narni Conrad's oath of unqualified fidelity on the Gospels, on the Cross, and on the Holy Reliques. He appointed the Cardinal San Gregorio Governor of the Dukedom of Spoleto, and of the County of Assisi and its domains. Conrad retired to Germany. In person Innocent visited Reate, Spoleto, Perugia, Todi; everywhere he was received as the Sovereign, as the deliverer. The Archbishop of Ravenna alone resisted the encroachments of Innocent, displayed the Imperial investiture, and preserved the territories of his church.<sup>b</sup> Throughout Italy, the precarious state of the Imperial power, the sudden rise of a vigorous Pontifical administration, gave new life to the popular and Italian cause. The Tuscan League, the Lombard League, renewed their approaches to more intimate relations with the Pope; but to the Tuscans the language of Innocent was that of a master. Their demands to choose their own rectors with a sovereign Prior to preside over their League, he answered by a summons to unqualified submission to him, as heir to the Countess Matilda, and sovereign of the whole Duchy of Tuscany. "I have seen," he said, "with my own eyes, that the Duchy of Tuscany belongs of right to the Pope." Without the Papal protection the League could not subsist: he warned the cities

Conrad of  
Lutzenberg.

lest, rejecting it, they should fall by the sword of the stranger.<sup>c</sup> But the most remarkable document is an address to all the cities, in which the similitude, now growing into favour, of the spiritual and temporal power to the sun and moon, the temporal only deriving a reflected light from the spiritual, is wrought out with careful study.<sup>d</sup> But as regarded Italy, both powers met in the supreme Pontiff. The Ghibelline city of Pisa was placed under an interdict for presuming to assert its daring independence of the League: a temporary suspension of the interdict was haughtily and ungraciously granted.

The German dominion was driven into the South: there it was still strong from the occupation of the chief fortresses.<sup>e</sup> Constantia, the widow of Henry, now Queen, or at least left natural guardian of the realm, deemed it prudent, or was actuated by her own inclinations, to separate herself from the German cause, and to throw herself and her son upon the native interest.

<sup>Queen Constantia.</sup> She sent three Neapolitan nobles to demand her infant son Frederick from Iesi, where he had been brought up by the wife of Conrad of Lutzenberg; she caused him to be crowned in Palermo as joint sovereign of Sicily. She disclaimed Markwald the Duke of Ravenna, and declared him an enemy to the king and to the kingdom. She commanded the foreign troops to leave Sicily: they retired, reluctant and brooding over revenge, to the castles on the mainland. She submitted to request the investiture of the realm for her son as a fief from the Papal See. Innocent saw his

<sup>c</sup> Epist. i. 15, 35.

<sup>d</sup> Epist. i. 401, and in the *Gesta*.

<sup>e</sup> Epist. i. 35. "Marcualdum im-

perii seneschalcum cum Teutonicis  
omnibus de regno exclusit."—Rich.  
San Germ.

own strength, and her weakness. He condescended to her petition on the condition of her paying due allegiance to him as her lord for the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, the patrimony of the Holy See.<sup>f</sup> He seized the opportunity of enforcing hard terms, the revocation of certain privileges which had been granted by his predecessors to the faithful Norman princes as the price of their fidelity. Constantia silently yielded ; she received a bull, which in the strongest terms proclaimed the absolute feudal superiority of the Pope over the whole kingdom of Naples and Sicily : that extraordinary pretension, grounded on no right but on the assertion of right, had now, by its repeated assertion on one part, its feeble denial or acceptance on the other, grown into an established usage. The bull pronounced that the kingdom of Sicily belonged to the jurisdiction and to the property of the Church of Rome. The Queen was to swear allegiance, her son to do so directly he came of age. A tribute was to be paid. The bishops, under all circumstances, had the right of appeal to Rome ; all offences of the clergy, except high treason, were to be judged by the ecclesiastical courts. Sicily became a subject-kingdom, a province of the Papacy, under the constant superintendence of a Legate.

Before the bull had been prepared, Constantia fell ill. Either in an access of devotion, or of maternal solicitude for her infant son, for whom she would secure the most powerful protection, she bequeathed him to the guardianship of his liege lord the Pope.<sup>g</sup> Innocent accepted the charge ; in his consolatory letter to the child, he assured Frederick, that though God had visited him by the death of his father and mother, he had provided him

---

<sup>f</sup> Epst. i. 410, 413.

<sup>g</sup> Innocent, Epst. i. 322.

with a more worthy father—his own vicar on earth; a better mother—the Church.<sup>h</sup>

Constantia died on the 27th of November.<sup>i</sup> Innocent A.D. 1198. was thus, if he could expel the Germans, virtually King of Sicily, master of his own large territories, and as the ally and protector of the great Republican Leagues, the dominant power in Italy; and all this in less than one year after his accession to the Papal throne.<sup>k</sup>

But the elements of discord were not so easily awed into peace. The last will of Constantia, besides the guardianship of the Pope, had appointed a Council of Regency: the Chancellor, the subtle and ambitious Walter of Palear Bishop of Troja (whose brothers, and perhaps himself, were in dangerous correspondence with Markwald), the Archbishops of Palermo, Monreale, and Capua. She trusted not to the unrewarded piety or charity of the Pontiff: for the protection of her son Sicily was to pay yearly thirty thousand pieces of gold;<sup>m</sup> all his other expenses were to be charged on the revenue of the kingdom. But her death opened a new scene of intrigue and daring to Markwald. He resumed the title of Seneschal of the Empire, laid claim to the administration of Sicily and the guardianship of the infant sovereign, alleging a testament of the Emperor, which

<sup>a</sup> Epist. i. 585.

<sup>i</sup> Aged 45; a year and 19 days after her husband.

<sup>k</sup> He interfered soon after in the affairs of the Lombard League. Parma and Piacenza had quarrelled about the possession of Borgo San Domnino. He commanded his legate to take counsel with the bishops to keep the peace; threatened excommunication, and ordered the castle to be placed in his own

hands.—Epist. ii. 39.

<sup>m</sup> The tarini varied in value. The ounce of gold, about 21 grammes, 10 cent. (French weight), was divided into 24 tarini. Its value would be about 2 francs, 63 c., 75 m. The 30,000 would amount to about 79,125 francs. M. Cherrier estimates that it would represent five times the amount in present money.—*Lutte des Papes*, ii. 40, note.

invested him in that charge. The nobles of Sicily, however they might dread or detest the Germans, were not more disposed to be the mere ministers of the Pope. They received the Legate who came to administer the oath of allegiance with coldness; he returned to Rome. Markwald, in the mean time, had placed himself at the head of a powerful band of adventurers: he fell on the town of San Germano, and had almost become master of the great monastery of Monte Casino, which was defended for eight days by a garrison of the Pope, and in which several cardinals had taken refuge. On the day of St. Maur, the beloved companion of St. Benedict, the serene sky was suddenly clouded; a terrific storm broke out, overthrew the tents of Markwald's army, and caused such a panic dread of the avenging saint, that they fled on all sides.<sup>n</sup> Innocent issued a proclamation summoning the whole realm of Naples and Sicily to arms. He reminded them of their sufferings under Markwald and Markwald's master; how their princes, and even the clergy, had been tortured, mutilated, blinded, roasted (as he says) before slow fires.<sup>o</sup> The Pope had not spared the Papal treasures: he had assembled troops for their aid from Lombardy, Tuscany, Romagna, Campania. In his warlike address to the clergy, they were commanded on every Sunday, and on every festival, to renew the solemn excommunication, with quenched candles and tolling bells, against Markwald and all his accomplices.<sup>p</sup>

<sup>n</sup> “Cœpit more Teutonico in terram monasterii desævire.”—Rich. San Germ. ad 1198. It is remarkable that Innocent says not a word in his letters of the miracle: he ascribes the discomfiture of Markwald to the valour of the barons and knights who had

taken arms on his side.

<sup>o</sup> “Vix est aliquis in toto regno, qui in se vel suis personis vel rebus, consanguineis vel amicis, grave non incurrit per Teutonicos detrimentum.”—Reg. Innocent. No. ii.  
<sup>p</sup> Epist. i. 557 to 566.

Markwald had again recourse to craft and dissimulation. Through the Archbishop of Mentz (who was in Rome on his return from the Holy Land) he made offers to the Pope which showed that he thought Innocent as unscrupulous as himself. He asserted the bastardy of Frederick; proposed that Innocent should invest him, Markwald, with the kingdom of Sicily. He would pay the Pope at once the enormous sum of 20,000 ounces of gold;<sup>1</sup> the like sum on being put in possession of Palermo. He would double the annual tribute, and rule the island under the absolute control of the Pope. These offers being rejected, he was seized with a sudden and passionate desire of spiritual reconciliation with the Church. It was a strange contest; Markwald endeavouring by humble civilities, by menaces, by lavish offers, to extort absolution on the easiest terms from the Cardinals. He declared himself ready to swear unreserved obedience in spiritual matters, in temporal more cautiously, to all just mandates of the Pope. Legates were sent to Veroli to receive his oath—Octavian the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, Guido Cardinal Presbyter of S. Maria in Transtevere, Ugolino Cardinal Deacon of S. Eustachio. He invited them to a banquet in a neighbouring convent, and Markwald himself served them with the utmost humility; but audible murmurs were heard at the close that they were to be taken prisoners, and compelled to grant the unconditional absolution. Octavian and Guido were frightened; Ugolino took courage, and produced a bull of the Pope, with which the wary Innocent had provided them, prescribing the form of the oath, which implied the absolute abandonment of the bailiwick of Sicily, restoration

---

<sup>1</sup> *Gesta, ch. xxii.*

of the patrimony of St. Peter, compensation for plunder, especially of the monastery of Monte Casino; and, above all, Markwald was to swear to respect the persons of all ecclesiastics, especially of the Cardinals of the Church. There was a wild and threatening tumult among the German soldiery and the populace against the Cardinals. But Markwald had not the courage to proceed to violence. The Legates were permitted to return to Veroli: Markwald took the prescribed oath, and received absolution.

But the absolution thus obtained at Veroli by a feigned submission was soon forfeited. Markwald would not renounce, he still affected the title <sup>May, 1199.</sup> of guardian of Sicily: he called himself Seneschal. In this name the jealous sagacity of Innocent detected latent pretensions to the protectorate. An excommunication more full, if possible, more express, more maledictory, was hurled against the recreant German. Every one who supplied provisions, clothing, ships, or troops to Markwald fell under the same anathema.<sup>r</sup> Any clerk who officiated in his presence incurred deprivation. Markwald retired to Salerno; a fleet from Ghibelline Pisa was ready to convey him to Sicily. He crossed the straits; received the submission of many cities, was welcomed by many noble families, by the whole Saracen population. Innocent pursued him with the strongest manifestoes. He addressed a letter to the counts, barons, citizens, and the whole people of Sicily. He reminded them of the atrocious cruelties perpetrated by the Emperor Henry and his German followers; announced the excommunication of Markwald, the absolution of all his adherents from their oaths

---

<sup>r</sup> Epist. ii. 179; and iii. 280.

of fidelity. "He is come to Sicily with the pirate William the Fat to usurp the throne; to say of the infant Frederick, 'This is the heir, let us slay him, and take possession of his inheritance.' He is leagued with the Saracens; he is prepared to glut their throats with Christian blood, to abandon Christian wives to their lusts." Towards the Saracens, nevertheless, Innocent expresses himself with mildness; "if they remain faithful to the King, he will not merely maintain, he will augment their privileges." The Pope went further: he addressed a solemn admonition to the Saracens. "They knew by experience the gentleness of the Apostolic See, the barbarity of Markwald. They had been eye-witnesses of his cruelties, the drowning in the sea, the roasting of priests over slow fires, the flagellation of multitudes. He who was so cruel to his fellow Christians would be even more ruthless to strangers, to those of other rites and other creeds. He who could ungratefully and rebelliously rise against the son of his liege lord would little respect the rights of foreigners; all oaths to them would be despised by one who had broken all his oaths to the Roman See."<sup>s</sup> With still more singular incongruity, he assures the Saracens that he has sent as their protectors the Cardinal of St. Laurence in Lucina, the Archbishops of Naples and Tarentum, as well as his own relatives John the Marshal and Otho of Palumbria.<sup>t</sup> Markwald, notwithstanding these denunciations and addresses, pursued his way and appeared before Palermo.

In Apulia, warlike cardinals, and even James the Marshal, the cousin of the Pope, though he showed considerable military skill as well as valour, were no

---

<sup>s</sup> Epist. ii. 226.

Epist. i. 489. Nov. 24, 1199.

antagonists against the disciplined and experienced Germans, Diephold, and Frederick Malati, who held Calabria. Innocent wanted a warrior of fame and generalship to lead his forces. France was the land to supply bold and chivalrous adventurers. Sybilla, the widow of Tancred of Sicily, dethroned by Henry, had made her escape from her prison in the Tyrol. She married her eldest daughter to Walter de Brienne, of a noble but impoverished house. Walter de Brienne came to Rome to demand the inheritance of his wife, the principality of Tarentum and the county of Lecce, which Henry had settled on the descendants of Tancred. Walter was the man whom Innocent needed. He was at once invested in the possession of Tarentum and Lecce; at the same time he was sworn to assert no claim to the kingdom, but to protect the rights of the infant Sovereign. Piety, justice, and policy, equally demanded this security for the Pontiff, as guardian of Frederick; a security precarious enough from a powerful, probably an ambitious stranger. Walter returned to France to levy troops. Markwald, in the mean time, with his own forces and with the Saracens, besieged Palermo; the Papal troops, headed by the Archbishop of Naples, the Marshal and the Legate, came, the former directly by sea, to the aid of Walter the Chancellor, who had refused all the advances of Markwald. A battle took place, in which Markwald suffered a total defeat. Magded, the Emir of the Saracens, was slain. In the baggage of Markwald was found, or said to be found, a will with a golden seal, purporting to be that of the Emperor Henry. It commanded his wife and son to recognise all the Papal rights over Sicily; it bequeathed Sicily, in case of the death of his son, in the fullest terms to the Pope. It commanded the imme-

diate restitution of the estates of the Countess Matilda by the Empire to the Pope. If this will was made during the last illness of the Emperor (yet it contemplates the contingency of his wife dying before him), he might have been disposed either as leaving a helpless wife and an infant heir, to secure the protection of the Pope, and so the surrender of the Matildine territories may have been designed as a direct reward for the confirmation of his son in the Empire; or the whole may have been framed in a fit of death-bed penitence. The suspicious part was another clause, bequeathing the duchy of Ravenna, with Bertinoro, and the march of Ancona, to Markwald;<sup>u</sup> but even this, if the Duke died without heirs, was to revert to the Roman See.

The appearance of Walter de Brienne at the head of <sup>June, 1201.</sup> a small but chosen band of knights; his commission by the Pope as the leader of the faithful,<sup>x</sup> his rapid successes, his defeat of Diephold before Capua, the retreat of the Germans into their fortresses, his peaceful occupation of Tarentum, Lecce, and great part of Apulia, alarmed, or gave pretence for alarm, to the great nobles of Sicily. The ambitious churchman Walter of Troja, the Chancellor, aspired to the vacant archbishopric of Palermo. Innocent had been obliged to consent to his taking possession of the temporalities of the See, though he withheld the pallium.<sup>y</sup> The Chancellor had the strongest apprehensions of the progress of Walter de Brienne. A gradual approximation took place between the Chancellor Archbishop and Markwald. The Chancellor was to leave

<sup>u</sup> The will is in the *Gesta*, xxvii. It is of very doubtful authenticity. Could it have been forged by Markwald, to be produced if occasion required? or was

it from other hands?

<sup>x</sup> "Domino protegente fideles ab in-

fidelibus."—*Gesta*, c. xxx.

<sup>y</sup> May 3, 1203.

Markwald in undisputed possession of Apulia, Markwald the Chancellor in that of Sicily. The friendship was hollow and mistrustful. Each suspected and accused the other of designs on the Crown—Markwald for himself, Walter for his brother, Gentile Count of Manupelles. Both, however, were equally jealous of Walter de Brienne: Markwald as already more than his equal in the kingdom of Naples. The Chancellor assumed loyal apprehension for the endangered rights of the infant Frederick, whom the Pope, as he suspected, would betray. Innocent was compelled to justify himself in a long letter addressed to the young Frederick, whom he warned to mistrust all around him, and to place his sole reliance on the parental guardianship of the Pope. The Chancellor Walter of Troja was now in the kingdom of Naples, levying money for the service of the realm, which he is accused of having done in the most rapacious manner, not sparing the treasures, nor even the holy vessels of the churches. He might plead, perhaps, the tribute paid by the realm to the Pope. To the Papal legate, the Bishop of Porto, he professed unbounded submission, took the oath of allegiance, and received absolution. When, however, he was commanded not to oppose Walter de Brienne, against whom he was in almost armed confederacy with the Germans, he broke fiercely out, as if in indignant patriotism: “If St. Peter himself uttered such command, he would not obey; the fear of hell should not tempt him to be guilty of such treason;” and he is said to have blasphemed (such is the term) against the Pope himself.\* From the presence of the Legate he set out openly to join Diephold. A battle took place near Bari.

Walter de Brienne, though embarrassed by the presence and the fears of the Legate, gained a complete victory: many important prisoners, among them a brother of Diephold, were taken.

But in Sicily as well as Naples the partisans of Walter of Troja, comprehending the greater part of the Sept. 1202.  
Death of  
Markwald. Norman and native nobles, were now in alliance with the Germans. Markwald entered Palermo, and became master of the person of the King. He died shortly after of an unsuccessful or unskilful operation for the stone. The palace and the person of the King were seized by a powerful Norman noble, William of Capperone. From him Walter the Chancellor, who still claimed to be Bishop of Troja, and, despite of the Pope, Archbishop of Palermo, endeavoured by a long course of intrigue to wrest away the precious charge. In the kingdom of Naples, the death of Walter de Brienne, who was surprised, taken, and who died of his wounds<sup>a</sup> as a prisoner of Diephold, gave back the ascendancy to the German party. The Pope was constrained to accept their precarious and doubtful submission; to admit them to reconciliation with the Church. Diephold became the most powerful subject, and more than a subject in the kingdom of Naples.

Thus grew up the young Frederick, the ward of the Pope, without that pious, or at least careful education<sup>b</sup> which might have taught him respect and gratitude to the Holy See; among Churchmen who conspired against or openly defied the head of the Church; taught from his earliest years by every party to mistrust the other; taught by the Sicilians to hate the Germans, by the

<sup>a</sup> The battle, the 11th of June, 1205.

<sup>b</sup> The Cardinal Cencio Savelli, afterwards the mild Honorius III., had at first the nominal charge of his education.

Germans to despise the Sicilians; taught that in the Pope himself, his guardian, there was no faith or loyalty; that his guardian would have sacrificed him, had it been his interest, to the house of Tancred. All around him was intrigue, violence, conflict. Government was almost suspended throughout Sicily. The Saracens hardly acknowledging any allegiance to the throne, warred with impartiality against the Christians of both parties; yet neither had any repugnance to an alliance with the gallant Infidels against the opposing party. Such was the training of him who was in a short time to wear the Imperial crown, to wage the last strife of the house of Hohenstaufen with his mother, rather perhaps his step-mother, the Church.

## CHAPTER II.

Innocent and the Empire,

THE Empire, now vacant, might seem to invite the commanding interposition of Innocent. It opened almost a wider field for the ambition of the Pope, and for those exorbitant pretensions to power which disguised themselves as tending to promote peace and order by expanding the authority of the Church, than Italy itself. But it was not so easy to reconcile these vast demands for what was called spiritual freedom, but which was in fact spiritual dominion, with the real interests of Germany. The prosperity, the peace of the Empire depended on the strength, the influence, the unity of the temporal power; the security, the advancement of the Papacy on its weakness and its anarchy. A vigorous and uncontested Sovereignty could alone restrain the conflicting states, and wisely and temperately administered, might advance the social condition of Germany. At all events, such sovereignty was necessary to spare the realm from years of civil war, during which armed adventurers grew up, from their impregnable castles warring against each other, defying all government, wasting the land with fire and sword, preventing culture, inhibiting commerce, retarding civilisation. But a powerful Emperor had always been found formidable to the Church, at least to the temporal rule of the Papacy; his claims to Italian dominion were only sus-

pended by his inability to enforce them; and the greater his strength, the less the independence of the German prelacy. The Emperor either domineered over them, or filled the important sees with his own favourites. The Pope could not but remember the long strife of his predecessors with the house of Hohenstaufen; in them was centred all the hostility, all the danger of Ghibellinism; they seemed born to be implacable foes of the Papacy: he might naturally shrink in execration at the recent cruelties of Henry, though he could hardly augur in the infant King of Sicily so obstinate an antagonist to his successors as Frederick II.

The perpetuation of the Empire in this haughty house was in itself a cause of serious apprehension; it added immeasurably to the Imperial power, and every subordinate consideration must be sacrificed to the limitation of that power.

Immediately after the death of Henry, his brother Philip,<sup>a</sup> abandoning his first intention of descending to the south, and of taking with him the young Frederick, hastened to the Alps, which he reached not without difficulty, pursued, even menaced, by the murmurs and imprecations of the Italians. Already had Henry in his lifetime obtained the oath of many of the German princes to his infant son, as King of the Romans and heir of the Empire. Philip at first asserted, and seemed honestly disposed to assert the claims of his nephew; but an infant Emperor was too contrary to German usage, manifestly so unsuited to

Philip retires  
to Germany.

\* Philip had been intended for <sup>1</sup> only Emperor to Apulia; was named Duke of Tuscany, 1195; married to the Princess Irene; Duke of Swabia, 1196. In 1191 he accompanied the orders, was provost of Aix-la-Chapelle, had been chosen Bishop of Wurtzburg in 1191.

the difficult times, that Philip consented to be chosen King by a large body of princes and of prelates

*March 6.*

assembled at Mulhausen.<sup>b</sup> But the adverse

party had not been inactive. The soul of this party was Adolph of Altena, the powerful, opulent, and crafty Archbishop of Cologne. The great prelates of the Rhine and the neighbouring princes seemed to claim a kind of initiative. The Archbishop of Mentz, Conrad of Wittlesbach, was absent in the Holy Land;<sup>c</sup> the Archbishop of Treves appeared at first on the side of the Archbishop of Cologne. They met at Andernach, and professed surprise that the rest of the princes were so slow in joining the legitimate Diet. They determined, of themselves, to raise up an antagonist to the house of Hohenstaufen. Several princes for different reasons refused to embark in the perilous contest. Berthold of Zahringen, who had once yielded, withdrew from prudence, or rather avarice.<sup>d</sup> Bernard of Saxony, as feeling himself unequal to the burthen of Empire, and already pledged to the cause of Philip. The prelates turned their thoughts at length to the house of Henry the Lion, the irreconcileable adversary of the house of Swabia. Henry, the eldest son, was engaged in the Crusades; the second, Otho, since the

*Otho.*      house had fallen under the ban of the Empire,

had resided at the court of England, under the protection of Richard of Cornwall. By his valour he had attracted the notice of his uncle, King Richard

<sup>b</sup> At Arnstadt, in Thuringia, according to Boehmer, Pref. p. ix. Compare the passage as to the spontaneous offer of the princes.

<sup>c</sup> Conrad of Radensburg, Bishop of

Hildesheim, later of Wurtzburg, once a fellow-student of Thomas à Becket, was also in the Holy Land; as also the eldest son of Henry the Lion.

<sup>d</sup> Annal. Argentin.

Cœur de Lion: he had been created first Count of York, afterwards Count of Poitou. Otho could not have lived under a better training for the fostering his hereditary hatred and thirst of revenge against the house of Hohenstaufen, or for the love of chivalrous adventure. He had nothing to lose, an imperial crown to win. His uncle, Richard of England, could never forget his imprisonment in Germany, and the part taken by the Emperor in that galling and disgraceful transaction. The perfidy and avarice of Henry were to be visited in due retribution on his race.<sup>e</sup> Otho set forth on his expedition, to gain the Imperial crown, well furnished with English gold,<sup>f</sup> with some followers, and with provisions of war. In May he was proclaimed Emperor at Cologne; he was declared the champion of the Church: he owed his election to a few Churchmen. The Archbishop of Cologne either represented, or pretended to represent, besides his own vote, the Archbishop of Mentz. English gold bought the avaricious Archbishop of Trèves. The Flemish nobles, allied with England, were almost unanimous in favour of Otho; many other princes, who had returned from the Crusades on the news of the Emperor's death, joined either from love of war, respect for the Church, or hatred of the Hohenstaufen, the growing party.

<sup>e</sup> By the English account King Richard by his money initiated the proceedings of Archbishop Adolph; he bought the crown for Otho: "Rex Richardus divitiis et consiliis pollens, tantum egit muneribus et xeniis suis erga Archiepiscopum Coloniæ et erga proceros imperii, quod omnibus aliis omissis, Othonem nepotem suum, in ræ

strenuitatis et elegantis corporis adolescentem elegerint."—Radulph. Coggeshal, ap. Martene, v. 851. Philip asserts this in his letter to the Pope.—Apud Innocent., Epist. i. 747.

<sup>f</sup> According to Arnold of Lubeck, 50,000 marks. "Quæ in summaris ferebant quinquaginta dextrarii."—c. vii. 17.

Nothing can be more sublime than the notion of a great supreme religious power, the representative of God's eternal and immutable justice upon earth, absolutely above all passion or interest, interposing with the commanding voice of authority in the quarrels of kings and nations, persuading peace by the unimpeachable impartiality of its judgements, and even invested its power to enforce its unerring decrees. But the sublimity of the notion depends on the arbiter's absolute exemption from the unextinguishable weaknesses of human nature. If the tribunal commands not unquestioning respect; if there be the slightest just suspicion of partiality; if it goes beyond its lawful province; if it has no power of compelling obedience; it adds but another element to the general confusion; it is a partisan enlisted on one side or the other, not a mediator conciliating conflicting interests, or overawing the collision of factions. Yet such was the Papal power in these times: often, no doubt, on the side of justice and humanity, too often on the other; looking to the interests of the Church alone, assumed, but assumed without ground to be the same as those of Christendom and mankind; the representative of fallible man rather than of the infallible God. Ten years of strife and civil war in Germany are to be traced, if not to the direct instigation, to the inflexible obstinacy of Pope Innocent III.

It was too much the interest of both parties to obtain the influence of the Pope in their favour, not to incline them outwardly at least to submit their claims to his investigation. But it was almost as certain that one party at least would not abide by his unfavourable decree: and however awful the power of excommunication with which there could be no doubt that the Pope would endeavour to compel obedience, in no in-

stance had the spiritual power, at least in later days, obtained eventual success.

Innocent assumed a lofty equity; but the house of Henry the Lion had ever been devoted to the Pope; the house of Swabia ungovernable, if not inimical. His first measure against Philip was one of cautious hostility. Philip was already under the ban of the Church—I. As implicated with his brother in the cruelties exercised against the family of the unfortunate Tancred, the rival favoured by the Pope for the throne of Sicily. II. As having held by Imperial grant the domains of the Countess Matilda, to which the Popes maintained their right by anathema against all who should withhold them from the See. The Bishop of Sutri was sent as Legate to demand of Philip the immediate release of Sybilla, the widow of Tancred, and of her daughters, who were imprisoned in Germany, as well as of the Archbishop of Salerno their partisan. The German prelates of the Rhine were commanded to support this demand, to sequester the goods of all who had presumed to assist in the incarceration of an Archbishop, in itself an act of sacrilege.<sup>g</sup> The Chapter of Mentz, in the absence of the Primate, was to pronounce an interdict not only on those concerned in the imprisonment, and the whole city in which it had taken place; but also to bring under the ban of the Church all German princes who did not heartily strive for their release: if satisfaction was not instantly made, the ban spread over the whole of Germany.<sup>h</sup> Philip himself was to be reminded of

<sup>g</sup> Epist. i. 24, 25.

<sup>h</sup> It is remarkable that Innocent dwells on the sins of the luxurious and effeminate Sicilians, who had been

visited on that account by the cruelties of the Germans, rather than on the tyranny and inhumanity of the Germans.—Epist. 25.

his state of excommunication, as usurper of the territories of the Church. Only on his giving full satisfaction on both points, the instantaneous release of the prisoners, especially the Archbishop of Salerno, and his surrender of all the lands of the Roman See, was the Bishop of Sutri empowered to grant absolution ; otherwise Philip could only receive it as a suppliant from the Pope himself. Thus the first act of the aspirant to the Empire was to be an acknowledgment of almost the highest pretensions of the Papal supremacy, a condemnation of his brother's policy, the cession of the lands of the Countess Matilda. Innocent had chosen a German by birth, perhaps from his knowledge of the language, for this important Legation, in full confidence, no doubt, that the interests of the Church would quench all feelings of nationality. But either from this nationality, from weakness, or love of peace, the Bishop of Sutri allowed himself to be persuaded by Philip to stretch to the utmost, if not to go beyond, his instructions. Philip consented in vague words to the amplest satisfaction ; and on this general promise, obtained a secret absolution from the Legate. Innocent disclaimed his weak envoy ; afterwards degraded him from his See, and banished him to a remote monastery, where he died in shame and grief.<sup>1</sup>

Yet Philip stood absolved by one representing the Papal authority. This objection to the validity of his election was removed ; and in most other respects his superiority was manifest. The largest and most powerful part of the Empire acknowledged him ; his army was the strongest ; the treasures which his brother had brought from Sicily were lavished with successful

---

<sup>1</sup> Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, i. 1275. Worms, June 29, 1198.

prodigality; his garrison as yet occupied Aix-la-Chapelle, the city in which the Emperors were crowned; all the sacred regalia were in his hands. The Rhenish prelates and the nobles of Flanders stood almost alone on the side of Otho; but Richard of England had supplied him with large sums of money; and with the aid of the Flemish princes he made himself master of July 10, 1198.  
 Aix-la-Chapelle, and was crowned in that city Coronation  
 by the Archbishop of Cologne. Philip cele- of two Em-  
 brated his coronation at Mentz, but the highest perors.  
 Prelate who would perform this rite was a foreigner, July 12, 1198.  
 at least not a German, Aimo, Archbishop of Aug. 15, 1198.  
 Tarentaise.

If Richard of England was on one side in this contest. Philip Augustus of France was sure to be on Philip  
 the other; and besides his rivalry with Augustus  
 England, the King of France had personal and hereditary of France.  
 cause for hostility to Otho; and with the house of Hohenstaufen he had ever maintained friendly alliance.<sup>k</sup>

Innocent seemed to await the submission of the cause to his arbitration; as yet, indeed, he was fully occupied with the affairs of Rome and Italy. Pope  
 The friends of Otho, who could well anticipate his Innocent.  
 favourable judgement, were the first to make their appeal. Addresses were sent to Rome in the name of Richard King of England, Count Baldwin of Flanders, the city of Milan, the Archbishop of Cologne, his suffragans the Bishops of Munster, Minden, Paderborn, Cam-

<sup>k</sup> Godef. Mon. Arnold Lubeck. See Von Raumer, iii. p. 107. Gerv. Tilb. The King of France, writing to the Pope: "Ad hæc cum rex Anglie per fas et nefas pecuniâ suâ mediante ne- potem suum ad imperiale apicem conatur intrudere, vos nullatenus in- trusionem illam, si placet, debetis admittere, quoniam in opprobrium corona nostre cognoscitur redundare." —Innocent, Epist. i. 690.

bray and Utrecht, the Bishop of Strasburg, the Abbots of Verden and Corvey, Duke Henry of Brabant, with many Abbots and Counts. Most of these documents promised the most profound submission on the part of Otho to the Church; specifically abandoned the detestable practice<sup>m</sup> of seizing the goods of bishops and abbots on their decease, and pledged all the undersigned to the same loyal protection of the Church and all her rights. The answer of Innocent was courteous, but abstained from recognising the title of Otho.

The civil war began its desolations. Philip at first gained great advantages; he advanced almost <sup>A.D. 1198.</sup> to the gates of Cologne; and retreated only on the tidings of the approach of a powerful army from Flanders. It was civil war in its most barbarous lawlessness. Bonn, Andernach, and other towns were burned; it is said that a nun was stripped naked, anointed with honey, rolled in feathers, and then set on a horse with her face to the tail, and paraded through the streets. Philip, on his side, wrought by indignation from his constitutional mildness, commanded the guilty soldiers to be boiled in hot water. The winter suspended the hostile operations.

Philip himself maintained a lofty silence towards Rome; he would not, it might seem, compromise the right of election in the princes and prelates of the realm, by what might be construed into the acknowledged arbitration of a superior authority. A year had now passed; the war, on the whole, had been to him advantage; the death of Richard of England had deprived Otho of his most formidable ally. Innocent could no longer brook delay; without his aid there wa

---

<sup>m</sup> “Consuetudinem illam detestabilem.

danger lest the cause of Otho should utterly fail. His expectations that both parties would lay the cause at his feet were disappointed; he was compelled to take the initiative. Unsummoned therefore by general consent, appealed to by but one party, he ascended as it were his tribunal; in a letter to the Archbishop of Cologne, though by no means committing himself, he allowed his favourable disposition to transpire somewhat more clearly. In an address to the Princes and Prelates, he declared his surprise that a cause on which depended the dignity or disgrace of the Church, the peace and unity or the desolation of the Empire, had not been at once submitted to him, in whom was vested the sole and absolute right of determining the dispute in the first and last resort. It was his duty to admonish them to put an end to this fatal anarchy. He would adjudge the crown to him who should unite the greater number of suffrages, and was the best deserving.<sup>a</sup> The merits of the case were thus left to no rigid rule of right, but vaguely yielded up to his arbitrary judgement. Philip, at the same time, found it expedient to announce his election, not to submit his claim, to the Court of the Pontiff.<sup>b</sup> He wrote from the city of Spires, that he had received with due honour the Bishop of Sutri and the Abbot of St. Anastasia, the envoys of the Pope. He had only kept them in his court to witness the course of affairs. He sent them now to announce that by God's merciful guidance all had turned out in his favour, the obstacles to his elevation were rapidly disappearing; he entreated his Holiness to turn an attentive ear to their report. At the same time came an address from the princes and prelates; the list, both of ecclesi-

<sup>a</sup> Epist. i. 690; date probably May 20.

<sup>b</sup> Spires, May 28.

astics and laymen, contrasted strongly with the few names which had supported the address of Otho.

Philip Augustus of France supported the demands of Philip's partisans. Among the princes were the king of Bohemia, the dukes of Saxony, Bavaria, Austria, Meran, and Lorraine, the margraves of Meissen, Brandenburg, and Moravia. The host of prelates was even more imposing. The archbishops of Magdeburg, of Treves (who had perhaps been bought back), and Besançon; the bishops of Ratisbon, Friesingen, Augsburg, Constance, Eichstadt, Worms, Spires, Brixen, and Hildesheim, with a large number of abbots, Herzfeld, Tegernsee, Elwangen. These had signed; but there were besides assenting to the address, Otho the palatine of Burgundy (Philip's brother), the dukes of Zahringen and Carinthia, the margraves of Landsberg and Bohberg; the palgraves of Thuringia, Wittlesbach, and numberless other counts and nobles; the Patriarch of Aquileia, the Archbishop of Bremen, the Bishops of Verden, Halberstadt, Merseburg, Naumburg, Osnaburg, Bamberg, Passau, Coire, Trent, Metz, Toul, Verdun, Liège. There was submission, at the same time something of defiance and menace, in their language. They declared that they had no design to straiten the rights of the Holy See; but they urged upon the Pope that he should not encroach on the rights of the Empire; they warned him against hostility towards Markwald the seneschal of the Empire, and declared themselves ready after a short repose, with the Emperor at their head, to undertake an expedition to Rome in great force.<sup>p</sup> The Pope replied to the princes and prelates

---

<sup>p</sup> The date of this address of the German princes and prelates is of some importance. Hurter places it in 1199. It is dated at Spires, v. Kal. Jun May 28. Georgish in his Regest assigns it to 1198; but if so, it was

that he had heard with sorrow of the contested election ; he should be prepared to join the Emperor who had been elected lawfully ; he should remember rather the good than the evil deeds of the Emperor ; it was by no means his desire to trench on his temporal rights, but to act for the good of the empire as of the church. They would judge better of his proceedings against Markwald, when better informed, and when they had closed their ears against the calumniators of the Roman see.

Conrad Archbishop of Mentz,<sup>q</sup> the Primate of Germany, of noble family, venerable for his age, his learning, and his character, had been absent in the Holy Land throughout all these proceedings. To him, supposing him to be yet in Palestine, Innocent addressed an epistle,<sup>r</sup> which explained the state of the contest, manifestly with a strong bearing towards Otho ; he declared that all his measures were for the greatness, not, as turbulent men asserted, for the destruction of the Empire. He enjoined him to send orders to his diocese, that all the officers, the ecclesiastics, and the barons dependent on the church of Mentz, should support the Emperor approved by the Holy See. Conrad had already set out for Europe, he passed through Rome ; and Innocent, after a long conference, invested him in full authority to re-establish peace in Germany. The Primate, on his part, promised to come to no final determination without sending previous information to the Pope. On the arrival of Conrad in Germany

ceded the coronation 30th of Otho and Philip. Von Raumer places it in his text in 1199, in his note in 1198. Boehmer in 1200.

<sup>q</sup> Conrad held the cardinal bishopric of S. Sabina, with the primacy of Mentz.—Epist. ii. 293.

<sup>r</sup> Epist. ii.

May 3, 1199.  
Nov. 6, 1199.  
St. James's  
day, July 25

both parties consented to a suspension of arms until St Martin's Day.

Both contending parties sent ambassadors to Innocent  
Embassies to Rome. May 28, 1200. Those of Otho were urgent, imploring, submissive. In every respect would the religious Otho submit himself to the wishes of the Pope. The envoys of Philip were the provost of St. Thomas at Strasburg, and a sub-deacon of the Roman Church. Perhaps none of the great prelates would trust themselves or could be trusted on such a mission. To then Innocent seized the occasion of proclaiming in a full consistory of Cardinals the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power. The whole of the Old Testament was cited to his purpose. The subordination of the kingship to the priesthood in Melchisedec and Abraham, the inferiority of the anointed to him who anoints; even Christ the anointed, is inferior as to his manhood, to the Father by whom he is anointed. Priests are called gods, kings, princes; the one have power on earth, the other in heaven; one over the soul, the other over the body; the priesthood is as much more worthy than the kingship as the soul than the body. The priesthood is older than the kingship: God gave Israel, who had long had priests, kings in his wrath. Only among the heathen was the kingdom the older; yet even Baal, who ruled over Assyria after the building of the tower of Babel, was younger than Shem. Then came allusion to the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, to the division of the priesthood by the wicked schismatic Jeroboam. From thence to modern times the transition was bold but easy. The happy times of Innocent II. and the Saxon Lothair and their triumph over Conrad and Anacletus were significantly adduced: "So truth even subdues falsehood." The allusion to Frederick Barbarossa

rossa was even more fine and subtle. In him the Empire was united while the Church was divided; but the schism and he who fostered the schism were stricken to the earth. Now the Church is one, the Empire divided. It concluded with the assertion that the Pope had transferred the Empire from the East to the West, that the Empire is granted as an investiture by the Pope. "We will read the letter of your lord, we will consult with our brethren, and then give our answer; may God enable us to act wisely for His honour, the advantage of the Church, and the welfare of the Empire." In his reply to the princes of Germany, the leaning of Innocent against Philip, though yet slightly disguised, was more clearly betrayed. If he had the majority of voices and the possession of the regalia, on the other hand must be taken into account the illegality of his coronation, his excommunication by the Church from which he had but fraudulently obtained absolution; the design to make the Empire hereditary in his house. The Archbishop of Cologne was arraigned in no moderate terms for presuming to submit the question to the diet of the Empire without the Pope's previous consent.\*

The assembly at Boppart in the previous year had come to nothing. Otho only appeared, neither Philip nor his supporters condescended to notice the summons. Again the war broke out, and raged with all its ferocity. Philip fell on the hereditary territories of the house of Guelf. The Archbishop of Magdeburg burned Helmstadt; Henry, the brother of Otho, ravaged the bishopric of Hildesheim, and threw himself into Brunswick, now besieged by Philip. Philip was obliged to withdraw with great loss and dishonour; he

June, 1092.

\* Epist. vol. i. p. 691.

returned to the Rhine, where his ally the Bishop of Worms was wasting the country round his own

Oct. 27.

city; he obtained a powerful ally in Conrad of Scharfenech, the coadjutor of the Bishop of Spires. The death of the peaceful Primate, Conrad of Mentz, destroyed all hopes, if hopes there were, of composing the strife by amicable negotiation. A double election for the primacy was the inevitable consequence of the all-pervading conflict. Hardly were the last obsequies paid to the remains of Conrad when the Chapter met. Both the elected prelates were men of noble German race. The partisans of Philip chose Leopold of the house of Schonfeld, who had succeeded his uncle in the See of Worms. Leopold was a churchman, strong in mind, strong in body, vigorous and violent; no less distinguished for the qualities of a warlike leader than an able prelate; he had been engaged in the Italian wars, and at least had not restrained his soldiers in the plunder of churches: his enemies described him as a tyrant rather than a bishop; and such was his daring that he is said, somewhat later, with all the pomp of burning torches, to have excommunicated the Pope himself.<sup>t</sup> The opposite party elected Siegfried, of the house of Eppstein, but Mentz being in possession of their adversaries, they withdrew to Bingen to confirm their election.

Innocent now determined to assume openly the function of supreme arbiter in this great quarrel.

Pope Innocent's deliberation.

The Cardinal Guido Pierleoni, Bishop of Palestrina, appeared in Germany with a Bull containing the full and elaborate judgement. This was the tenour of the Bull — “It belongs to the Apostolic See to pass

---

\* Cæsar. Heisterb. Dialog. Mirac. ii. v.

judgement on the election of the Emperor, both in the first and last resort;" in the first, because by her aid and on her account the Empire was transplanted from Constantinople; by her as the sole authority for this transplanting, on her behalf and for her better protection: in the last resort, because the Emperor receives the final confirmation of his dignity from the Pope; is consecrated, crowned, invested in the imperial dignity by him. That which must be sought is the lawful, the right, the expedient." Innocent proceeds to discuss at length the claims of the three kings,\* the child (Frederick of Sicily), Philip, and Otho. He admits the lawful election, the oath twice taken, and once at least freely, by the Princes of the Empire to the young Frederick. " His cause it might seem incumbent on the Apostolic See, as the protector of the orphan, to maintain; and lest, when come to riper years, in his wrath at having been deprived of the Empire by the Papal decree, he should become hostile to the Pope and withdraw the kingdom of Naples from her allegiance to the Holy See. But, on the other hand, on whom did this election fall? to whom was this oath sworn? To one not merely incapable of ruling the Empire, but of doing anything; a child of two years old, a child not yet baptised." The Deliberation enlarges on the utter unfitness of a child for such a high office in such perilous times. " Woe unto the realm, saith the Scripture, whose king is a child. Dangerous, too, were it to the Church to unite

\* It was the Emperor, not the King of the Germans. Innocent, in theory, held to this distinction. The Germans had full right to choose their king, but their king, being also by established usage Emperor, came under the direct cognisance of the Pope.—Epist. i. 697.

\* According to M. Abel (*Philip dei Hohenstaufen*), the *Deliberatio* was not a published document; at all events it contains the views and reasonings of Innocent. The results were to be communicated to the Princes of the Empire by his Legates.

the Empire with the kingdom of Sicily. Yet never will Frederick in riper years be able justly to reproach the See of Rome with having robbed him of his Empire; it is his own uncle who will have deprived him of that crown, of his paternal inheritance, and who is even endeavouring by his myrmidons to despoil him of his mother's kingdom, did not the holy Church keep watch and ward over his rights.<sup>3</sup>

"Neither can any objection be raised against the legality of the election of Philip. It rests upon the gravity, the dignity, the number of those who chose him. It may appear vindictive, and therefore unbecoming in us, because his father and his brother have been persecutors of the church, to visit their sins on him. He is mighty too in territory, in wealth, in people; is it not to swim against the stream to provoke the enmity of the powerful against the Church, we who, if we favoured Philip, might enjoy that peace which it is our duty to ensue?

"Yet is it right that we should declare against him. Our predecessors have excommunicated him, justly, solemnly, and canonically: justly, because he has violently seized the patrimony of St. Peter; solemnly, in St. Peter's church on a high festivity during the sacrifice of the mass. He has obtained absolution, it is true, from our Legate, the Bishop of Sutri, but in direct contradiction to our express commands. Besides he is under the ban pronounced against Markwald and all, Germans as well as Italians, who are his partisans. It is moreover notorious that he swore fealty to the child; he is guilty therefore of perjury: he may allege that we

---

<sup>3</sup> Remark this provident anticipation of Frederick's future cause of quarrel with the See of Rome, and the blame cast on his relative.

have declared that oath null; but the Israelites, when they would be released from their oath concerning Gibeon, first consulted the Lord; so should he first have consulted us, who can alone absolve from oaths. But if father shall succeed to son, brother to brother, the Empire ceases to be elective, it becomes hereditary; and in what house would the Empire be perpetuated? —a house in which one persecutor of the church succeeds to another. The first Henry who rose to the Empire (the Pope goes back to King Henry V., with whom the Hohenstaufen had but remote connexion), violently and perfidiously laid hands on Pope Paschal, of holy memory, who had crowned him; imprisoned him with his cardinals, whom he threatened to murder, until Paschal, in fear for Henry not for himself, appeased the madman by concession. The said Henry chose an heresiarch as an Antipope, set up an idol against the Church of Rome, so that the schism lasted till the time of Pope Calixtus. From this house came Frederick, who promised to subdue the rebellious Tiburtines to the See of Rome, but retained them as liegemen of the Empire, and threatened our ancestor the Chancellor Alexander, who asserted the rights of St. Peter, that if it were in the church of St. Peter he should feel how sharp-edged were the swords of the Germans; who plotted to dethrone Pope Hadrian, alleging that he was the son of a priest; who fomented a long schism against Alexander; deceived and besieged Pope Lucius in Verona. His son and successor Henry was accursed even on his accession, for he invaded and wasted the lands of St. Peter, and in contempt of the Church cut off the noses of some of the servants of our brother. He took the murderers of Bishop Albert among his followers, and bestowed large fiefs upon them. He

caused the Bishop of Osimo, because he declared that he held his see of the Apostolic throne, to be struck on the mouth, to have his beard plucked out, with other shameless indignities. By his commands Conrad put our honoured brother the Bishop of Ostia in chains, and rewarded his sacrilege with lands and honours; he prohibited all appeals from the clergy to Rome throughout the kingdom of Sicily. As to Philip himself, he has ever been an obstinate persecutor of the church; he called himself Duke of Tuscany and Campania, and claimed all the lands up to the gates of the city; he is endeavouring even now by the support of Markwald and of Diephold to deprive us of our kingdom of Sicily. If, while his power was yet unripe, he so persecuted the holy Church, what would he do if Emperor? It behoves us to oppose him before he has reached his full strength. That the sins of the father are visited on the sons, we know from holy writ, we know from many examples, Saul, Jeroboam, Baasha." The Pope exhausts the Old Testament in his precedents.

" Now, as to Otho. It may seem not just to favour his cause because he was chosen but by a minority; not becoming, because it may seem that the Apostolic chair acts not so much from goodwill towards him, as from hatred of the others; not expedient because he is less powerful. But as the Lord abases the proud, and lifts up the humble, as he raised David to the throne, so it is just, befitting, expedient, that we bestow our favour upon Otho. Long enough have we delayed, and laboured for unity by our letters and our envoys; it beseems us no longer to appear as if we were waiting the issue of events, as if like Peter we were denying the truth which is Christ; we must therefore publicly

declare ourselves for Otho, himself devoted to the Church, of a race devoted to the Church, by his mother's side from the royal house of England, by his father from the Duke of Saxony, all, especially his ancestor the Emperor Lothair, the loyal sons of the Church; him, therefore, we proclaim, acknowledge as king; him then we summon to take on himself the imperial crown."

Innocent, now committed in the strife, plunged into it with all the energy and activity of his character. To every order, to the archbishops, bishops and clergy, to the princes and nobles, to every distinguished individual, the Archbishops of Cologne and Magdeburg, the Archbishop of Aquileia, the Palgrave of the Rhine, the Landgrave of Thuringia, the King of Bohemia, the Counts of Flanders and of Brabant, were addressed letters from the See of Rome, admonitory, persuasive, or encouraging, according to their attachment or aversion to the cause of Otho. The Legate in France had directions to break off, if possible, the alliance of Philip Augustus with the Duke of Swabia:<sup>\*</sup> John of England was urged to take more active measures in favour of Otho; the Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina crossed the Alps with his co-legate the Brother Philip; January,  
March. he had an interview in Champagne with the legate in France, the Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. They proceeded to Liège, from thence to Aix-la-Chapelle. At Neuss Otho appeared before the three Papal legates, and took an oath of fidelity to the Pope couched in the strongest terms. He swore to maintain all the terri-

---

\* Rather later the Pope endeavours to alarm Philip Augustus. Philip (the Emperor), he says, had claimed the guardianship of Frederick II. and the possession of Sicily. If he had gained

this "in superbium elatus aliud cogitat, et regnum Francorum sibi disponeret subjugare, wicut olim dispuuerat frater ejus Henricus."—Epist. i. 717. Did Innocent believe this?

tories, fiefs, and rights of the See of Rome, granted by all the Emperors downwards, from Louis the Pious; to maintain the Pope in the possessions which he now holds, to assist him in obtaining those which he does not now occupy; to render the Pope that honour and obedience which has ever been rendered by the pious Catholic Emperors. He swore to conduct himself as to the affairs of the Roman people, the Lombard and Tuscan leagues, according to the Pope's counsel, as also in any treaty of peace with the King of France. "If on my account the Church of Rome is involved in war, I will aid it with money. This oath shall be renewed both by word of mouth and in writing when I shall receive the imperial crown." The Cardinal Guido departed to Cologne; in the name of Innocent he

The Legate proclaims Otho.

June 8, 1201.

June 29.

Otho's Diet at Cologne.

proclaimed Otho Emperor, amid the applause of Otho's partisans. He awaited the concourse of prelates and nobles which he had summoned to Cologne: few came; some even of the bishops closed their doors against the messengers of the Legate. Again he summoned them to Corvey, and began to threaten the interdict. From thence he went to Bingen, where he spoke more openly of the interdict. From Bingen letters were written to the Pope, describing the progress of Otho's affairs as triumphant. "Nothing now is heard of

Sept. 8, 1201. Philip and his few partisans; with him as under God's displeasure every thing fails, he can gather no army; while Otho will soon appear at the head of 100,000 men."

The Cardinal could hardly intend to deceive the Pope, he was no doubt himself deceived. At that very time were assembled at Bamberg, the Archbishops of Magdeburg and Bremen, the Bishops of Worms, Passau, Ratisbon, Constance,

Philip's

Diet at

Bamberg.

Augsburg, Eichstadt, Havelberg, Brandenburg, Meissen, Naumburg, and Bamberg; the Abbots of Fulda, Herzfeld, and Kempten; the King of Bohemia, the Dukes of Saxony, Austria, Steyermark, Meran, Zahringen, the "Stadtholder of Burgundy," and a number of other princes. They expressed themselves in terms of which the contemptuousness was but lightly veiled. They refused to believe (reason would not admit, loyal simplicity would not believe) that the unseemly language which the Bishop of Palestrina, who gave himself out as the Legate of the Pope, presumed to hold regarding the Empire, had been authorised by the admirable wisdom of the Pope, or by the honoured conclave of the Cardinals. "Who has ever heard of such presumption? What proof can be adduced for pretensions, of which history, authentic documents, and even fable itself is silent? Where have ye read, ye Popes! where have ye heard, ye Cardinals! that your predecessors or your legates have dared to mingle themselves up with the election of a king of the Romans, either as electors, or as judges? The election of the Pope indeed required the assent of the Emperor, till Henry I. in his generosity removed that limitation. How dares his holiness the Pope to stretch forth his hand to seize that which belongs not to him? There is no higher council in a contested election for the Empire, than the Princes of the Empire. Jesus Christ has separated spiritual from temporal affairs. He who serves God should not mingle in worldly matters; he who aims at worldly power is unworthy of spiritual supremacy. Punish, therefore, most holy Father, the Bishop of Palestrina for his presumption, acknowledge Philip whom we have chosen, and, *as it is your duty*, prepare to crown him."

Innocent replied in somewhat less dictatorial and imperious language; “it was not his intention Nov. 2. to interfere with the rights of the electors, but it was his right, his duty, to examine and to prove the fitness of him whom he had solemnly to consecrate and to crown.”<sup>a</sup> His Legates had instructions to proceed with the greatest caution, to pause before they proclaimed the direct excommunication of the great prelates of the realm. These prelates were already under the ban, which comprehended the partisans of Philip. But of the virtual or direct excommunication they were equally contemptuous: not a prelate was estranged from Philip or attached to Otho by the terror of the Papal censures. This array of almost all the great ecclesiastics of Germany against the Pope during this whole contest is remarkable, but intelligible enough. Almost all the richer and more powerful Bishoprics were held by sons or kinsmen of the noble houses; they were German princes as well as German prelates. The survey of the order shows at once the ecclesiastical state of the realm, and unfolds the nature of the strife. The rivals for the Primacy, the Archbishopric of Mentz, were both of noble houses—Leopold of the house of Schonfeld, Siegfried of that of Eppstein. Leopold’s ambition was to retain the Bishopric of Worms with that of Mentz. The Pope at once repudiated this monstrous demand, irrespective of the ulterior claims to the Primacy, which he adjudged to Siegfried. But the Chapter of Mentz, with three exceptions, were for Leo-

---

• “Non enim elegimus nos personam, sed electo ab eorum parte majori (Innocent had up to this time acknowledged the election of Otho to have been by a minority) qui vocem habere in imperatoris electione noscuntur, et ubi debuit, et a quo debuit coronato, favorem præstimus et præstamus.”—Epist. i. 711.

pold and Philip (it was the same cause to them). Mentz long refused to open her gates to the Pope's Primate. Leopold, warlike, enterprising, restless, seems to have nourished a mortal hatred to Innocent; he threw back, as has been said, the ban of the Pope, and solemnly excommunicated the successor of St. Peter; and at length, leaving both the See to which he aspired and that which he actually possessed, he descended into Italy, in order to instigate the cities of Romagna to throw off the Papal yoke. The banner of the Archbishop of Mentz floated in the van of the anti-Papal army. In many of these cities the Bishop of Worms met with success; and hence, when after the death of Philip a general amnesty was granted to his civil and ecclesiastical partisans, Leopold only was excluded, and abandoned to the vengeance of the Pope. Such was the state of the Primacy; like the Empire, an object of fierce and irreconcileable strife. The Archbishop of Treves, timid, avaricious, and time-serving, was on the side which paid him best. He had been inclined to Otho, then fell off to Philip. At one time he offered to resign his See, and then, being supported by the inhabitants of Treves, declared for Philip. He was excommunicated by the Legate; the Archbishop of Cologne was empowered to seize his domains; yet even when he was bought to the party of Philip, he made excuses to elude a public meeting and acknowledgment of the Emperor. Adolph, Archbishop of Cologne, had raised Otho to the Empire, crowned him in Aix-la-Chapelle; he had been the soul of the confederacy; but already there were dark rumours of his treachery and meditated revolt. That revolt took place at length; but wealthy Cologne repudiated her perfidious Prelate, maintained her fidelity to Otho, declared Adolph de-

posed, and elected a new Prelate, the Bishop of Bonn. The Archbishop of Salzburg was for Philip; he was held in such high respect that to him was entrusted the protestation of the Diet of Bamberg; he alone, at a later period, seemed worked upon by the Papal influence to incline somewhat more to the cause of Otho. The Archbishop of Bremen in his remote diocese contented himself with a more quiet support of Philip; the Archbishop of Magdeburg was unmoved alike by the friendly overtures of Innocent, and by the excommunication of the Legate. The Archbishop of Besançon received Philip with the utmost pomp, led him to his cathedral, and gave him all the honours of an Emperor. The Archbishop of Tarantaise had officiated at the coronation of Philip. The Bishops of Bamberg, Halberstadt, Spires, Passau, Eichstadt, Freisingen openly showed their contempt for the Papal mandates; the three latter, in defiance of the Pope, maintained the right of the Bishop of Worms to the Primacy. The Bishop of Spires seized two servants of the Pope, imprisoned one and threatened to hang the other. The Archbishops of Besançon and Tarantaise, the Bishops of Spires and Passau were cited to Rome to answer for their conduct; they paid not the least regard to the summons.

The murder of the Bishop of Wurtzburg is a more frightful illustration of the state of things. Conrad of Rabensberg was related by his mother to the house of Hohenstaufen; he had been appointed Chancellor of the Empire by Henry. He was on his way to the Crusade, when he heard that the Chapter of Hildesheim had chosen him their Bishop. He fulfilled his vow. On his return he found that he had been elected Bishop of Wurtzburg. Conrad was tempted by the

wealthier see, which was in the neighbourhood of the house of his race. He would willingly have retained both. So important was his support to Philip, that he was confirmed in the office of Chancellor, and received the gift of the castle of Sternberg. Innocent ordered the Archbishop of Mentz to take possession of the estates of Wurtzburg; issued injunctions to the Archbishop of Magdeburg to interdict Conrad in the diocese of Hildesheim, and to command the Chapter to proceed to a new election. Yet there were secret intimations, that a man of his high character and position might find favour in Rome. To Rome he went; he returned Bishop of Wurtzburg; and if not now an opponent, but a lukewarm partisan of Philip. He was threatened with the loss of his dignity as Chancellor,<sup>b</sup> perhaps became the object of persecution. His murder was an act of private revenge. He had determined to put down the robbers and disturbers of the peace round Wurtzburg. One of the house of Rabensberg presumed on his relationship to claim an exception from this decree; he was beheaded by the inflexible Conrad. The kinsmen of the executed robber, Bodo of Rabensberg, and Henry Hund of Falkenberg, resented this act of unusual severity. Two of their followers stole into Wurtzburg, murdered the Bishop on his way to church, and mutilated his body. When Philip came to Wurtzburg, the clergy and people showed him the hand of the murdered Bishop and demanded vengeance.<sup>c</sup> Philip gave no redress: he was charged with more than indifference to the fate of a Bishop who had fallen off to Otho. The citizens broke

Dec. 3, 1202.

<sup>b</sup> Compare Innocent's letters.—Reg. i. 201; i. 223. He is called Chancellor at the time of his murder.

<sup>c</sup> Arnold Lubec.—Leibnitz, ii. 726.

out, took and razed the castles of the suborners of the murder. These men fled to Rome, confessed their sin, and submitted to penance.<sup>a</sup> The penance is characteristic of the age; it was a just but life-long martyrdom. They were to show themselves naked, as far as decency would permit, and with a halter round their necks, in the cathedral of every city in Germany, through which lay their way from Rome, till they reached Wurtzburg. There, on the four great feasts, and on the day of St. Kilian the tutelar saint of the city, they must appear and undergo the discipline of flagellation. They might not bear arms, but against the enemies of the faith, nor wear rich attire. Four years they were to serve, but in the garb of penitence, in the Holy Land. All their life they were to fast and pray, to receive the Eucharist only on their death-bed.<sup>b</sup>

For ten dreary years, with but short intervals of truce, Germany was abandoned to all the horrors of civil war.<sup>c</sup> The repeated protestations of Innocent, that he was not the cause of these fatal discords, betray the fact that he was accused of the guilt; and that he had to wrestle with his own conscience to acquit himself of the charge. It was a war not of decisive battles, but of marauding, desolation, havock, plunder, wasting of harvests, ravaging

<sup>a</sup> Raynald. sub ann. 1203.

<sup>b</sup> The inscription on the place of the murder—

"Hic procumbo solo, sceleri quia parcere  
nolo,  
Vulnera facta dolo dant habitare polo."  
—Böhmer, *Fontes*, I. 36.

<sup>c</sup> Thus says Walther der Vogelweide—

"Zu Rom hört ich liegen,  
Zwei könige betrügen;

Das gab den aller-grösten Streit,  
Der jemals ward in aller Zeit,  
Da sah man sich entzweien  
Die Pfaffen und die Laien.  
Die Noth war über alle Noth:  
Da lagen Leib und Seele todt.  
Die Pfaffen wurden Krieger,  
Die Laien blieben Sieger,  
Das Schwert sie legten aus der Hand,  
Und griffen zu der Stola Band,  
Sie bannten wen sie wollten.  
Nicht den sie bannen sollten.  
Zerstört war manches Gottes haus."  
—Simrock, p. 174; Lachmann, 9  
Harter, II. 98.

open and defenceless countries; war waged by Prelate against Prelate, by Prince against Prince; wild Bohemians and bandit soldiers of every race were roving through every province. Throughout the land there was no law: the high roads were impassable on account of robbers; traffic cut off, except on the great rivers, from Cologne down the Rhine, from Ratisbon down the Danube; nothing was spared, nothing sacred, church or cloister. Some monasteries were utterly impoverished, some destroyed. The ferocities of war grew into brutalities; the clergy, and sacred persons, were the victims and perpetrators. The wretched nun, whose ill-usage has been related, was no doubt only recorded because her fate was somewhat more horrible than that of many of her sisters. The Abbot of St. Gall seized six of the principal burghers of Arbon, and cut off their feet, in revenge for one of his servants, who had suffered the like mutilation for lopping wood in their forests.

Innocent seemed threatened with the deep humiliation of having provoked, inflamed, kept up this disastrous strife only for his own and his Emperor's discomfiture and defeat. Year after year the cause of Otho became more doubtful; the exertions, the intrigues, the promises, the excommunications of Rome became more unavailing. The revolt of the Archbishop of Cologne gave a fatal turn:<sup>s</sup> the example of Adolph's perfidy and treachery wrought widely among Otho's most powerful partisans. There were few, on Otho's side at least, who had not changed their party; Otho's losses were feebly compensated by the defections from the ranks of Philip.

Innocent  
obliged to  
acknowledge  
Philip.

Nov. 11,  
1204.

<sup>s</sup> Two grants (Böhmer's *Regesta sub ann. 1205*) show the price paid for the archbishop's perfidy.

At the close of the ten years the contest had become almost hopeless; even the inflexible Innocent was compelled to betray signs of remorse, of reconciliation, of accepting Philip as Emperor, of abandoning Otho,<sup>h</sup> of recanting all his promises, and struggling out of his vows of implacable enmity and of perpetual alliance. Negotiations had begun.

<sup>June, 1206.</sup> Philip's ambassadors were received in Rome: two Legates, Leo, the Cardinal Priest of Santa Croce, Cardinal Ugolino Bishop of Ostia and Velletri, were in Worms: Philip swore to subject himself in all things to the Pope. Philip was

<sup>Aug. 1207.</sup> solemnly absolved from his excommunication.

<sup>Christmas, 1207.</sup> At Metz the Papal Legates beheld the victorious Emperor celebrate his Christmas with kingly

<sup>Murder of Philip.</sup> splendour.<sup>i</sup> From this abasing position Innocent was relieved by the crime of one man.

The assassination of Philip by Otho of Wittelsbach placed Otho at once on the throne.

The crime of Otho of Wittelsbach sprang from private revenge. Otho was one of the fiercest and most lawless chieftains of those lawless times; brave beyond most men, and so far true and loyal to the house of Swabia. Philip had at least closed his eyes at one murder committed by Otho of Wittelsbach. He had promised him his daughter in marriage; but the father's

<sup>h</sup> Compare Otho's desperate letter of covert reproach to Innocent, Epist. i. 754. Innocent's letter to the Archbishop of Salzburg betrays something like shame, i. 748. In 1205 Innocent reproached the bishops and prelates of Otho's party—"ex eo quod nobilis vir Dux Suecia visus est aliquantulum prosperare, contra honestatem propriam et fidem præstitam venientes, relieto eo cui prius adhaerent, ejus adversario

adhaerent."—Epist. i. 742. The Guelfic author of the *Chronicon Placentinum* (edited under the auspices of the Duke de Luynes, Paris, 1856) boldly accuses Innocent of corruption: "audiens illum potentem esse sine timore ipsius, auro et argento corruptus," &c., p. 30.

<sup>i</sup> Reg. Imp. Chron. Ursberg.—Epist. i. 750, of Nov. 1. Compare Abel, *Philip der Hohenstaufür*, p. 211.

gentle heart was moved; he alleged some impediment of affinity to release his child from the union with this wild man. Otho then aspired to the daughter of the Duke of Poland. He demanded letters of recommendation from the King Philip. He set forth with them, but some mistrust induced him to have them opened and read; he found that Philip had, generously to the Duke of Poland, perfidiously as he thought to himself, warned the Duke as to the ungovernable character of Otho. He vowed vengeance. On St. Alban's day Philip at Bamberg had been celebrating the nuptials of his niece with the Duke of Meran. He was reposing, having been bled, in the heat of the day, on a couch in the palace of the Bishop. Otho appeared with sixteen followers at the door, and demanded audience as on some affair of importance; he entered the chamber brandishing his sword. "Lay down that sword," said Philip, with a scornful reproach of perfidy: Wittlesbach struck Philip on the neck. Three persons were present, the Chancellor, the Truchsess of Waldburg, and an officer of the royal chamber. The Chancellor ran to hide himself, the other two endeavoured to seize Otho; the Truchsess bore an honourable scar for life, which he received in his attempt to bolt the door. Otho passed out, leaped on his horse, and fled. So died the gentlest, the most popular of the house of Swabia.<sup>k</sup> The execra-

<sup>k</sup> Philip had been compelled during the long war grievously to weaken the power of his house by alienating the domains which his predecessors had accumulated. "Hic cum non haberet pecunias quibus salario sive solda præberet militibus, primus coepit distrahere prædia, quæ pater suus Fredericus imperator late acquisierat in Alemanniâ; sicque factum est ut nihil sibi re-

maneret præter inane nomen dominii terræ, et curtales seu villas in quibus fora habentur et pauca castella terræ." —Chron. Ursberg. 311. The poems of Walther der Vogelweide are the best testimony to the gentleness and popularity of Philip. See der Pfaffen Wahl, p. 180; especially Die Milde, 184. Simrock.

tion of all mankind, the ban of the Empire pursued the murderer. The castle of Wittelsbach was levelled with the ground, not one stone left on another: on its site was built a church, dedicated to the Virgin. The assassin was at length discovered in a stable, after many wanderings and it is said after deep remorse of mind, and put to death with many wounds.

## CHAPTER III.

Innocent and the Emperor Otho IV.

OTHO was now undisputed Emperor; a diet at Frankfort, more numerous than had met for many years, acknowledged him with almost unprecedented unanimity. He held great diets at Nuremberg, Brunswick, Wurtzburg, Spires. He descended the next year over the Brenner into Italy to receive the Imperial crown. Throughout Italy the Guelfic cities opened their gates to welcome the Champion of the Church, the Emperor chosen by the Pope, with universal acclamation: old enemies seemed to forget their feuds in his presence, tributary gifts were poured lavishly at his feet.

The Pope and his Emperor met at Viterbo; they embraced, they wept tears of joy, in remembrance of their common trials, in transport at their common triumph. Innocent's compulsory abandonment of Otho's cause was forgotten: the Pope demanded security that Otho would surrender, immediately after his coronation, the lands of the Church, now occupied by his troops. Otho almost resented the suspicion of his loyalty; and Innocent in his blind confidence abandoned his demand.

The coronation took place in St. Peter's Church with more than usual magnificence and solemnity; magnificence which became this unwonted Oct. 24. friendship between the temporal and spiritual powers;

solemnity which was enhanced by the lofty character and imposing demeanour of Innocent. The Imperial crown was on the head of Otho; and—almost from that moment the Emperor and the Pope were implacable enemies. Otho has at once forgotten his own prodigal acknowledgment: “All I have been, all I am, all I ever shall be, after God, I owe to you and the Church.”<sup>a</sup> Already the evening before the coronation, an ill-omened strife had arisen between the populace of Rome and the German soldiery: the Bishop of Augsburg had been mishandled by the rabble. That night broke out a fiercer fray; much blood was shed; so furious was the attack of the Romans even on the German knights, that 1100 horses are set down as the loss of Otho’s army: the number of men killed does not appear. Otho withdrew in wrath from the city; he demanded redress of the Pope, which Innocent was probably less able than willing to afford. After some altercation by messengers on each side, they had one more friendly interview, the last, in the camp of Otho.

The Emperor marched towards Tuscany; took possession of the cities on the frontier of the territory of the Countess Matilda, Montefiascone, Acquapendente, Radicofani.<sup>b</sup> He summoned the magistrates and the learned in the law, and demanded their judgement as to the rights of the Emperor to the inheritance of the Countess Matilda. They declared that the Emperor had abandoned those rights in ignorance, that the Emperor might resume them at any time. He entered Tuscany.

<sup>a</sup> “Quod hactenus fuimus, quod sumus et quod erimus . . . totum vobis et Romanæ ecclesiæ post Deum debere . . . gratantissime recognoscimus.”—Regest. Ep. 161.

<sup>b</sup> Chronic. Ursberg. Ric. de S. Germ. spredo juramento. At Spires (March 22) Otho had solemnly guaranteed the patrimony of St. Peter.—Epist. Innocent. i. 762.

Sienna, San Miniato, Florence, Lucca, before all, Ghibelline Pisa, opened their gates.<sup>c</sup> He conferred privileges or established ancient rights. He proceeded to the Dukedom of Spoleto, in which he invested Berthold, one of his followers. Diephold came from the south of Italy to offer his allegiance; he received as a reward the principality of Salerno. Otho attempted Viterbo. He had his emissaries to stir up again the imperial faction in Rome. He cut off all communication with Rome; even ecclesiastics proceeding on their business to the Pope were robbed. Vain were the most earnest appeals to his gratitude, even the most earnest expostulations, the most awful admonitions, excommunication itself. Otho had learned that, when on his own side, Papal censures, Papal interdicts might be defied with impunity.

After all his labours, after all his hazards, after all his sacrifices, after all his perils, even his humiliations, Innocent had raised up to himself a more formidable antagonist, a more bitter foe than even the proudest and most ambitious of the Hohenstaufen. Otho openly laid claim to the kingdom of Apulia; master of Tuscany and Romagna, at peace with the Lombard League, he seized Orvieto, Perugia. He prepared, he actually commenced a war for the subjugation of Naples. The galleys of Pisa and Genoa were at his command; Diephold and others of the old German warriors, settled in the kingdom of Apulia, entered into his alliance.

His successes in the kingdom of Naples but inflamed his ambition; he would now add Sicily to his dominions, and expel the young Frederick, the last of the house of

<sup>c</sup> Otho's acts are dated in almost every great city in Italy—Florence, Lucca, Milan, Pavia, Lodi, Brescia, Vercelli, Piacenza, Modena, Todi, Reate, Sora, Terni, Ravenna, Ferrara, Parma, Capua, Aversa, Veroli, Bologna.

Hohenstaufen. It might seem almost in despair that Innocent at length, on Holy Thursday,<sup>d</sup> A.D. 1211. uttered the solemn excommunication: he commanded the Patriarchs of Grado and Aquileia, the Archbishops of Ravenna, Milan, and Genoa, and all the Bishops of Italy to publish the ban. Otho treated this last act of sovereign spiritual authority with utter indifference. Every thing seemed to menace Innocent and even the Papal power itself. In Rome insurrection seemed brooding for an outbreak; while Innocent himself was preaching on a high festival, John Capocio, one of his old adversaries, broke the respectful silence:—“Thy words are God’s words, thy acts the acts of the devil!”

But Otho knew not how far he had reached the power of Innocent and of the Church. While Italy seemed to submit to his sway, his throne in Germany Aug. 1209. March, 1212. was crumbling into dust. For nearly three years, three years of unwonted peace, he had been absent from Germany. But he had left in Germany an unfavourable impression of his pride, and of his insatiable thirst for wealth and power. Siegfried Archbishop of Mentz, more grateful to the Pope than Otho for his firm protection in his days of weakness and disaster, accepted the legatine commission, and with the legatine commission, orders to publish the excommunication throughout Germany. The kindred, the friends of the Hohenstaufen, heard with joy that the Pope had been roused out of his infatuated attachment to their enemy. Rumours were industriously spread abroad that Otho meditated a heavy taxation of the Empire, not excepting

---

<sup>d</sup> According to some accounts it was uttered, perhaps threatened, on the octave of St. Martin (Nov. 18, 1210).—Chronie. Ursberg. Ric. de San Germ.

ing the lands of the monasteries ; that as he had expressed himself contemptuously of the clergy, refusing them their haughty titles, he now proposed to enact sumptuary laws to limit their pomp. The archbishop was to travel but with twelve horses, the bishop with six, the abbot with three. By rapid degrees grew up a formidable confederacy, of which Innocent no doubt had instant intelligence, of which his influence was the secret moving power. Even in Italy there were some cities already in open hostility, in declared alliance with Innocent and Frederick. At Lodi Otho declared Genoa, Cremona, Ferrara, the Margrave Azzo under the ban of the Empire.<sup>e</sup> At Nurem-<sup>Ascension Day.</sup>berg met the Primate and the Archbishop of Treves venturing for once on a bold measure, the Archbishop of Magdeburg, the Chancellor of the Empire, the Bishop of Spires, the Bishop of Basle, the Landgrave of Thuringia, the King of Bohemia, and all the other nobles attached to the house of Swabia. They inveighed against the pride of Otho, his ingratitude and hostility to the Pope ; on the internal wars which again threatened the peace of Germany. The only remedy was his deposition, and the choice of another Emperor. That Emperor must be the young Frederick of Sicily, the heir of the great house, whom in evil hour they had dispossessed of the succession : to him they had sworn allegiance in his cradle, to the violation of that oath might be attributed much of the afflictions and disasters of the realm. Two brave and loyal Swabian knights, Anselm of Justingen and Henry of Niffen, were deputed and amply furnished with funds, to invite the young Frederick to resume his ancestral throne.

\* Francisc. Pepin. Murat. ix. 640. Galvan. Flamma, xi. 664. Sicard. Crem. vii. p. 813.

A.D. 1211.

Anselm and his companions arrived at Rome. Innocent dissembled his joy; <sup>f</sup> he hesitated indeed to become a Ghibelline Pope; he could not but remember the ancient, rooted, inveterate oppugnancy of the house of Hohenstaufen to the See of Rome. But fear and resentment for the ingratitude of Otho prevailed; he

<sup>Oct. 1211.</sup> might hope that Frederick would respect the guardianship of the Pope, guardianship which had exercised but questionable care over its ward. The Swabians passed on to Palermo; they communicated the message of the diet at Nuremberg; they laid the Empire before the feet of Frederick, now but seventeen years old. Frederick even at that age seemed to unite the romantic vivacity of the Italian, and the gallantry of his Norman race, with something of German intrepidity; he had all the accomplishments, and all the knowledge of the day; he spoke Latin, Italian, German, French, Greek, Arabic; he was a poet: how could he resist such an offer? There was the imperial crown to be won by bold adventure; revenge on Otho, who had threatened to invade his kingdom of Sicily; the restoration of his ancestral house to all its ancestral grandeur. The tender remonstrances of his wife,<sup>g</sup> who bore at this time his first-born son; the grave counsels of the Sicilian nobles, reluctant that Sicily should become a province of the Empire, who warned him against the perfidy of the Germans, the insecure fidelity of the Pope, were alike without effect.<sup>h</sup> He hastened to desert his sunny Palermo for cold Germany; to leave his gay

<sup>f</sup> "Qui licet hoc bene vellet, tamen dissimulavit."—Rigord. | fons King of Arragon, in Aug. 1209.

<sup>g</sup> Frederick had been married at fifteen to Constantia, widow of K. | Henry VII. was born early in 1212. | <sup>h</sup> Chroniq. Ursberg. Chron. Foss Americ of Hungary, daughter of Al-

Nov. Murat. vii. 887.

court for a life of wild enterprise, and all which was so congenial to the natural impulses of his character, to war with his age, which he was already beyond. Ever after Frederick looked back upon his beloved Sicily with fond regret; there, whenever he could, he established his residence, it was his own native realm, the home of his affections, of his enjoyments.

The Emperor Otho heard of the proceedings in Germany; he hurried with all speed to repress the threatening revolt.<sup>1</sup> As he passed through Italy, he could not but remark the general estrangement; almost everywhere his reception was sullen, cold, compulsorily hospitable.<sup>k</sup> The whole land was prepared to fall off. Appalling contrast to his triumphant journey but two or three years before! In Germany it was still more gloomy and threatening. He summoned a diet at Frankfort; March 6,  
1212. eighty nobles of all orders assembled, one bishop, the Bishop of Halberstadt.<sup>m</sup> Siegfried of Mentz, now Papal Legate, with Albert of Magdeburg, declared the Archbishop of Cologne, Dietrich of Heinsberg, deposed from his see under the pretext of his oppression of the clergy and the monks. Adolph, the former archbishop, the most powerful friend, the most traitorous enemy of Otho, Feb. 27, 1211 appeared in the city, was welcomed with open arms by

<sup>1</sup> "Otho cum totam fere sibi Apuliam subjugasset, audit quod quidam Italæ principes ibi rebellaverant mandato apostolico, regnum festinus egreditur mense Novembri."—Ric. S. Germ. Chron. Foss. Nov. Francisc. Pepin.

<sup>k</sup> "Gravis Italicis, Alemannis gravior, fines attigit Alemanniæ; a nullo uti principi occurritur, nulli gratus excipitur."—Conrad de Fabaria, Canon.

S. Galli, Pertz, xi. p. 170. The author a monk of S. Gall, describes Frederick's subsequent reception at his monastery.

<sup>m</sup> "Ubi octoginta principes ei occurserunt multum flenti et de rege *Francia* conquerenti . . . Ubi curiæ archepiscopi et episcopi pauci interfuerunt, ea quod de mandato domini Papæ eum excommunicatum denunciaverant."—Rem. Leod. apud Martene, v.

the clergy, and resumed the see, as he declared, with the sanction of the Pope. War, desolating lawless war, broke out again throughout Germany. The Duke of Brabant, on Otho's retreat, surprised Liège; plundered, massacred, respected not the churches; their altars

<sup>May 3.</sup> were stripped; their pavements ran with blood; a knight dressed himself in the bishop's robes and went through a profane mockery of ordination to some of his freebooting comrades. The bishop was compelled to take an oath of allegiance. He soon fled and pronounced an interdict against the Duke and his lands. The Pope absolved him from his oath.

Otho made a desperate attempt to propitiate the adherents of the house of Swabia. In Nordhausen he <sup>Aug. 7, 1212.</sup> celebrated with great pomp his nuptials with Beatrice the daughter of the Emperor Philip, to whom he had been long betrothed. This produced only more bitter hatred. Four days after the marriage Beatrice died. The darkest rumours spread abroad: she had been poisoned by the Italian mistresses of Otho.

Frederick in the mean time, almost without attendants, with nothing which could call itself an army, set off to win the imperial crown in Germany. <sup>March, 1212.</sup> At Rome he was welcomed by the Pope, the Cardinals, and the senate. He received from Pope Innocent counsel, sanction, and some pecuniary aid for his enterprise. Four galleys of Genoa conveyed him

<sup>May 1 to July 9.</sup> with his retinue from Ostia to that city, placed under the ban of the Empire by Otho. Milan was faithful to her hatred of the Hohenstaufen; <sup>n</sup> he

---

\* Compare letter of Innocent rebuking Milan for her attachment to Otho—“reprobo et ingrato, immo Deo 692 Oct. 21, 1212. There is a very

et hominibus odioso, qui nunquam nisi mala pro bonis retribuit.”—Epist. ii.

dared not venture into her territory ; the passes of Savoy were closed against him ; he stole from friendly Pavia to friendly Cremona. He arrived safe at the foot of the pass of Trent, but the descent into the Tyrol was guarded by Otho's partisans. He turned obliquely, by difficult, almost untrodden passes, and dropped down upon Coire. Throughout his wanderings the Archbishop of Bari was his faithful companion. Arnold, Bishop of Coire, in defiance of the hostile power of Como, which belonged to the league of Milan, welcomed him with loyal hospitality. The warlike Abbot of St. Gall had sworn, on private grounds, deep hatred to Otho : he received Frederick with open arms. At St. Gall he heard that Otho was hastening with his troops to occupy Constance. At the head of the knights, the liegemen of the Abbot of St. Gall, Frederick made a rapid descent, and reached Constance three hours before the forces of Otho. The wavering Bishop, Conrad of Tegernfeld, declared against the excommunicated Otho ; Constance closed its gates against him. That rapid movement won Frederick the Empire. At Basle he was welcomed by the Bishop of Strasburg at the head of 1500 knights. All along the Rhine Germany declared for him ; he had but to wait the dissolution of Otho's power ; it crumbled away of itself. The primate Siegfried of Mentz, secured Mentz and Frankfort ; even Leopold the deposed Bishop of Worms, the rival Archbishop of Mentz, the turbulent and faithful partisan of the house of Hohenstaufen, was permitted to resume his See of Worms.<sup>o</sup> Frederick

curious account of the Lombard politics on this occasion in the Chronicon Placentinum, p. 37. Piacenza ever sided with Milan.

<sup>o</sup> Leopold had been absolved before Philip's death, Nov. 1207. Epist. Innocent., i. 731.

was chosen Emperor at Frankfort, and held his court  
 Dec. 2. at Ratisbon. Otho retired to his patrimonial  
 Feb. 2. domains in Saxony; he was still strong in  
 the north of Germany; the south acknowledged Frederick. On the Lower Rhine were some hostilities, but  
 between the rivals for the Empire there was no great battle. The cause of Frederick was won by Philip  
 Augustus of France. Philip had welcomed, and had entered into a close alliance with Frederick.<sup>p</sup> The King of England, the Count of Flanders, and the other  
 Princes of the Lower Rhine arrayed themselves in  
 May 27, 1214. league with Otho. The fatal battle of Bouvines  
 broke almost the last hopes of Otho; he re-  
 tired again to Brunswick; made one bold incursion,  
 A.D. 1215. and with the aid of the Bishop Waldemar  
 seized on Hamburgh. But to his enemies  
 was now added the King of Denmark. Again he re-  
 treated to the home of his fathers, passed the last  
 July 25. three years of life in works of piety and the  
 May 19, 1217. foundation of religious houses. Long before  
 his death Frederick had received the royal crown from  
 the hands of Siegried of Mentz at Aix-la-Chapelle.  
 He was now undisputed King and Emperor, in amity  
 with the Church; amity hereafter to give place to the  
 most obstinate, most fatal strife, which had yet raged  
 between the successor of St. Peter and the successor of  
 the Cæsars.

---

<sup>p</sup> Frederick had an interview with Louis, elder son of Philip, between Vaucoleurs and Tours, Nov. 1212.

## CHAPTER IV.

Innocent and Philip Augustus of France.

THE kingdom of France under Philip Augustus almost began to be a monarchy. The crown had risen in strength and independence above the great vassals who had till now rivalled and controlled its authority. The Anglo-Norman dukedom, which, under Henry II., in the extent of its territory and revenues, its forces, its wealth, with his other vast French territories, had been at least equal to that of France, had gradually declined, and Philip Augustus, the most ambitious, unscrupulous, and able man who had wielded the sceptre of France, was continually watching the feuds in the royal family of England, of the sons of Henry against their father, in order to take every advantage, and extend his own dominions. With Philip Augustus Innocent was committed in strife on different grounds than in the conflict for the German empire. The Emperors and the Popes were involved in almost inevitable wars on account of temporal rights claimed and adhered to with obstinate perseverance, and on account of the authority and influence to be exercised by the Emperor over the hierarchy of the realm. The Kings of France were constantly laying themselves open to the aggressions of the Supreme Pontiff by the irregularity of their lives. The Pope with them assumed the high function of assertor of Christian morals and of the sanctity of the marriage tie, as the champion of injured and pitiable

women. To him all questions relating to matrimony belonged as arbiter in the last resort; he only could dissolve the holy sacrament of marriage; the Pope by declaring it indissoluble, claimed a right of enforcing its due observance. Pope Cœlestine had bequeathed to his successor the difficult affair of the marriage of Philip Augustus; an affair which gave to Innocent the power of dictating to that haughty sovereign.

Isabella of Hainault, the first wife of Philip Augustus, A.D. 1190. the mother of Louis VIII., had died before the Dec. 27, 1191. king's departure for the Holy Land. Three A.D. 1194. years after his return he determined on a second marriage. Some connexion had sprung up between the kingdoms of Denmark and of France. Denmark was supposed to inherit from Canute the Great claims on the crown of England; claims which, however vague and obsolete, might be made use of on occasion to disturb the realm of his hated rival; his rival as possessing so large a part of France, his personal rival throughout the Crusades, Richard of England. Richard was now a prisoner in Germany; if Philip had no actual concern in his imprisonment, he was not inactive in impeding his liberation. Rumour spoke loudly of the gentle manners, the exquisite beauty, especially the long bright hair, of Ingeburga, the sister of the Danish king. Philip sent to demand her in marriage; it was said that he asked as her dowry the rights of Denmark to the throne of England, a fleet and an army to be at his disposal for a year. The prudent Canute of Denmark shrunk from a war with England, but proud of the royal connexion, consented to give the sum of 10,000 marks with his sister. Ingeburga arrived in France, Philip Augustus hastened to meet her at Amiens; that night, it was asserted by the queen but

strenuously denied by Philip, he consummated the marriage. The next morning, during the coronation, the king was seen to shudder and turn pale. It was soon known that he had conceived an unconquerable disgust towards his new queen. Every kind of rumour spread abroad. He was supposed to have found some loathsome personal defect, or to have suspected her purity ; some spoke of witchcraft, others of diabolic influence.<sup>a</sup> He proposed to send her back at once to Denmark ; her attendants refused the disgraceful office of accompanying her, shamed and repudiated, to her brother. Ingeburga remained in France, or in the neighbouring Flanders ; while the king sought means for the dissolution of this inauspicious marriage. Some of his courtiers, as might be expected, urged him to indulge his will at all hazards ; others, the more sober, to struggle against his aversion. He is said a second time to have entered her chamber ;<sup>b</sup> by her account to have exercised the rights of a husband, but this he again denied. Her ignorance of the language, and her awkward manners, strengthened his repugnance. The only means of dissolving the sacrament of marriage was to prove its invalidity. The Church had so extended the prohibited degrees of wedlock that it was not difficult by ascending and descending the different lines to bring any two persons of the royal houses within some relationship. A genealogy was soon framed by which Philip and his queen were brought within these degrees.<sup>c</sup> The obsequious clergy of France, with the Archbishop of Rheims at their head, pronounced at

<sup>a</sup> *Gesta*, ch. xlviii. “suggerente dia-  
olo.” Such is the cause assigned by  
the ecclesiastical writers.

<sup>b</sup> “Asserebat autem Regina quod Rex

eam carnaliter cognoverat; Rex vero a  
continuo affirmabat quod ei non po-  
tuerat carnaliter commiscere.”—*Gesta*,  
*ibid.*

<sup>c</sup> *Gesta*, *ibid.*

once the avoidance of the marriage. The humiliating tidings were brought to Ingeburga; she understood but imperfectly, and could scarcely speak a word of French.

A.D. 1196. She cried out — “wicked, wicked France!

Rome, Rome!” She refused to return to Denmark: she was shut up in the convent of Beaure-paire, where her profound piety still further awoke compassion, especially among the clergy.<sup>d</sup> Philip Augustus affected to disdain, but used every violent measure to impede, her appeal to Rome.

Philip’s violent passions did not rest in the dissolution of the marriage with Ingeburga; he sought to fill her place. Yet three nobly born maidens refused the hand of the King of France, either doubting the legality of any marriage with him, or disdaining to expose themselves to his capricious rejection; among them was the daughter of Herman of Thuringia, Otho’s most powerful adherent in his conflict for the empire. At length,

Agnes of Meran. Agnes, the beautiful daughter of Bertholdt, Duke of Meran, a partisan of Philip, hazarded the dangerous step. The passion of Philip for Agnes was as intense as his hatred of Ingeburga: towards her his settled aversion became cruel persecution. She was dragged about from convent to convent, from castle to castle, to compel her to abandon her pertinacious appeal to Rome. Agnes of Meran, by her fascinating manners, no less than by her exquisite beauty, won the

<sup>d</sup> Stephen of Tournay wrote in her behalf to the Cardinal Archbishop of Rheims. His Scriptural and classical knowledge is exhausted in finding examples for her wisdom and beauty. “Pulcra facie, sed pulchrior fide, annis juvencula sed animo cana; pæne dixerim Sarra maturior, Rachele gravior,

Annæ devotior, Susannæ castior.” He adds, “non deformior Helenæ, non abjectior Polyxenæ.” She never sate, but always stood or knelt in her oratory. “If the Ahasuerus of France would but rightly acquaint himself with her, she would be his Esther.”—Apud Baluz. Miscell. lib. i. p. 420.

hearts of the gallant chivalry of France, as well as of their impetuous King. She rode gracefully, she mingled in all the sports and amusements of the court, even in the chase; the severe clergy were almost softened by her prevailing charms. The King of Denmark pressed the cause of his injured sister before Pope Cœlestine. The Pontiff sent a Legate to France.<sup>e</sup> The King haughtily declared that it was no business of the Pope's. The clergy of France were cold and silent, not inclined to offend their violent sovereign. Cœlestine himself wanted courage to provoke the resentment of a monarch so powerful and so unscrupulous. So stood affairs at the death of Cœlestine.

Almost the first act of Innocent after his accession was a letter to the Bishop of Paris, in which, after enlarging on the sanctity of marriage, he expresses his profound sorrow that his beloved son Philip, whom he intended to honour with the highest privileges, had put away and confined in a cloister his lawful wife, endangering thereby his fame and salvation. The King is to be warned, that if his only son should die, as he cannot have legitimate offspring by her whom he has superinduced, his kingdom would pass to strangers. Innocent attributes to this crime of the King a famine which was affecting France; he expresses his reluctance, at the same time his determination, to take stronger measures in case of the contumacy of the King.<sup>f</sup> How far the Bishop of Paris fulfilled the

Sept. 1198.

\* To the same year, probably before the marriage to Agnes, belongs the letter of Ingeburga (apud Baluzium, Miscell. iii. 21). In this she asserts that three years before the date she had been married to Philip Augustus; that he had exercised the rights of a husband; that she was now a prisoner in a lonely castle; that the king despised the letters of his holiness, refused to hear the cardinals, and disregarded the admonitions of his prelates and religious men.

<sup>f</sup> Epist. 1, ccclv., to the archbishop.

Pope's commands is unknown. Before the close of the year the Pope sent as his Legate to France, Peter of Capua, Cardinal of St. Maria in Viâ Latâ, afterwards known as the Cardinal of St. Marcellus. The legate's commission contained three special charges, each of which might seem highly becoming the head of Christendom.<sup>g</sup> I. To establish peace between the Kings of France and England. II. To preach a new crusade. III. To compel the King to receive his unjustly discarded wife. Innocent, in his letter to the King, is silent as to the marriage; his tone is peremptory, commanding not persuading peace. If Philip Augustus does not *humbly* submit to the monition of the legate within a prescribed time, the realm is to be placed under an interdict—an interdict which will suspend all sacred offices, except the baptism of infants, and the absolution of the dying. Any clerk who shall presume to violate the interdict is to be amerced by the loss of his benefices and his order. The hatred of Philip Augustus and of Richard was deep, inveterate, and aggravated by the suspicion, if not the certainty on the part of Richard, that his rival of France was not unconcerned in his long imprisonment. But at this juncture peace was convenient to Philip; he accepted the Papal mediation. Richard was more refractory; but even Richard, embarrassed with the payment of his ransom, involved in the doubtful affairs of Flanders, eager for the cause of Otho in Germany, was disposed to bow before the menace of a Papal interdict, or to conciliate the favour of Innocent.<sup>h</sup> A truce was agreed upon for

---

&c., of France to receive the Legate; | peace in Europe is, that war may be  
ecclv. to the King of France. As | more actively carried on in the Holy  
Christ's Vicegerent the Pope is bound | Land.      <sup>g</sup> Epist. i. 4.  
to enforce peace; his argument for |      <sup>h</sup> Epist. ii. xxiii. *et seqq.*

five years; the Legate was to watch, and visit with spiritual penalties the violation of the truce. The Crusade was preached with some success. The Counts Theobald of Troyes, Louis of Blois, Baldwin of Hainault, the Count of St. Pol, the Bishops of Troyes and of Soissons, and one or two Cistercian abbots obeyed the summons, and took up the Cross.

But to the command to receive again the hated Ingeburga, and to dismiss the beloved Agnes of Meran, Philip Augustus turned a deaf and contemptuous ear. The Cardinal dared not any longer delay to execute the peremptory mandate of the Pope. This mandate, brief and imperious, allowed some discretion as to the time, none as to the manner of enforcing obedience. "If within one month after your communication the King of France does not receive his queen with conjugal affection, and does not treat her with due honour, you shall subject his whole realm to an interdict: an interdict with all its awful consequences." Twice before, for causes relating to marriage, Kings of France had been under the Papal censure; but excommunication smote only the persons of Robert I. and his Queen Bertha; that against Philip I. and Beltrada laid under interdict any city or place inhabited by the guilty couple.<sup>Dec. 6, 1199.</sup> Papal thunders had grown in terror and in power; they now struck kingdoms. The Legate summoned a council at Dijon. There appeared the Archbishops of Rlieims, of Lyons, of Besançon, of Vienne, eighteen bishops, with many abbots, and high dignitaries of the Church. Two presumptuous ecclesiastics, who had been sent to cite the King, were turned ignominiously out of doors; mes-

sengers however appeared from the King, protesting in his name against all further proceedings, and appealing to the Pope. The orders to the Legate were express to admit no appeal. On the seventh night of the council was pronounced the interdict with all its appalling circumstances. At midnight, each priest holding a torch, were chanted the Miserere and the prayers for the dead, the last prayers which were to be uttered by the clergy of France during the interdict. The cross on which the Saviour hung was veiled with black crape; the reliques replaced within the tombs; the Host was consumed. The Cardinal in his mourning stole of violet pronounced the territories of the King of France under the ban. All religious offices from that time ceased; there was no access to heaven by prayer or offering. The sobs of the aged, of the women and children, alone broke the silence. The interdict was pronounced at Dijon; some short delay was allowed before it was publicly promulgated in the presence of the clergy at Vienne. So for the injustice of the king towards his queen the whole kingdom of France, thousands of immortal souls were cut off from those means of grace, which if not absolutely necessary (the scanty mercy of the Church allowed the baptism of infants, the extreme unction to the dying), were so powerfully conducive to eternal salvation. An interdict was not like a war, in which the subjects suffer for the iniquities, perhaps the crimes, of their kings. These are his acts as a monarch, representing at least in theory the national will. The interdict was for the sin of the man, the private individual sin. For that sin a whole nation at least thought itself in danger of eternal damnation.

“O how horrible, how pitiable a spectacle it was (so writes one who had seen and shuddered at the workings

of an interdict) in all our cities! To see the doors of the churches watched, and Christians driven away from them like dogs; all divine offices ceased; the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord was not offered; no gathering together of the people as wont at the festivals of the saints: the bodies of the dead not admitted to Christian burial, but their stench infected the air, and the loathsome sight of them appalled the living; only extreme unction and baptism were allowed. There was a deep sadness over the whole realm, while the organs and the voices of those who chanted God's praises were everywhere mute.”<sup>j</sup>

Of the clergy of France, some in servile, or in awe-struck obedience, at once suspended all the offices of the Church. The Bishops of Paris (the Archiepiscopate of Sens was vacant), of Senlis, Soissons, Amiens, Arras, the Canons of Sens, being more immediately under royal jurisdiction, ventured on timorous representations. “The people were in a state of pious insurrection. They had assembled round the churches, and forced the doors; it was impossible to repress their determination not to be deprived of their services, their tutelary saints, their festivals. The King threatened the clergy with the last extremities.” Innocent rejected their frivolous excuses, which betrayed their weak faith; the Church must no longer labour under this grievous scandal; all who had not fulfilled the Papal mandate before Holy Thursday were to answer for it at Rome. But some sense of national independence, some compassion for their people, some fear of the King, induced others to delay at least the full obedience, the Archbishop of Rheims, the Bishops of Laon, Noyon, Auxerre, Beauvais,

<sup>j</sup> Radulph. Coggeshal. Chron. Anglic. apud Martene, v.

Boulogne, Chartres, Orleans. The Bishop of Auxerre was the boldest, he aspired through the King to the vacant archbishopric of Sens!<sup>k</sup>

Philip Augustus was not of a spirit to brook these encroachments; and his haughty temper was inflamed by his passion for Agnes of Meran. He broke out into paroxysms of fury. "By the sword joyeuse of Charlemagne" (we recognise the language of the Romances of the Trouvères), "Bishop," so he addressed the Bishop of Paris, "provoke not my wrath. You prelates, provided you eat up your vast revenues, and drink the wines of your vineyards, trouble yourselves little about the poor people. Take care that I do not mar your feasting, and seize your estates."<sup>m</sup> He swore that he had rather lose half his dominions than

<sup>k</sup> Gesta, 56.

<sup>m</sup> Gesta, Chronique de St. Denis. Among the most curious illustrations of the age is a poem, written by Giles Corbeil, physician of Philip Augustus, of 5925 hexameter lines. Corbeil was before known by poems on subjects relating to his profession. This new poem has but recently come to light; it was written probably under Honorius III. about 1219, but refers to the times of Innocent. It is a furious satire against the pride, luxury, and irreligiousness of the French hierarchy. The Legate under Innocent, Cardinal Gualo of Vercelli, is not spared:—

"Guttore pomposo tumido Galone relicto,  
Qui Gallicanum, Crasso felicior, aurum  
Sorbuit, argento mensas spoliavit, et  
omnes  
Divitias rapuit, harpye more rapacis;  
Qui culicem colando volens glutire ca-  
melum,  
Impositus collis onus importabile nostris,  
Tollere cum non posset idem, dightoque  
movere;

Qui tantis iterum laqueis moderamine  
nullo  
Strinxit et arctavit, coetus prohibendo  
solutos,  
Quod sacra conjugii plerique refragula  
frangunt  
Per fas atque neris, sine lege vel ordine  
currunt,  
Atque vias veteres recolunt, dudumque  
sepultos  
Enormes renovant antiqui temporis actus:  
Et pejus faciunt, pravusque repululat  
error.  
Quae quamvis prohibenda forent, quia  
talia proscripti  
Mactat et elidit divini regula juris.  
Ipse tamen, posito cunctis moderamine  
rebus,  
Simplicibus verbis, hortatibus atque mo-  
destis  
Extrpari debuerant anathemate  
dempto."

In the account of this poem, by M. V. Le Clerc, in the xx. tome of the Hist. Littéraire de la France, will be found ample illustrations of this speech of Philip Augustus; on the dress, the table, the habits and manners of the hierarchy. The poem is called "Gesta Pigrorum," p. 337, et seqq.

part from Agnes of Meran, who was flesh of his flesh. He expelled many of the ecclesiastics, who dared to obey the Pope, from their benefices, and escheated all their property. The King's officers broke into the palace of the Bishop of Senlis, carried off his horses, habiliments, and plate. Ingeburga was seized, dragged from her cloister, and imprisoned in the strong castle of Etampes.<sup>a</sup> But the people, oppressed by the heavy exactions of Philip Augustus, loved him not; their affections, as well as their religious feelings, were with the clergy. The barons and high vassals threatened: they actually began to rise up in arms. Innocent might seem to have acted with sagacious policy, and to have taken the wise course to humiliate the King of France. With strange mercy, while he smote the innocent subjects of Philip, the more awful sentence of personal excommunication was still suspended over the King's head and that of Agnes of Meran; it was reserved for a last, a more crushing blow, but one perhaps which might have led to perilous consequences. He had even (he boasts of his lenity) spared the uncle of the King, the Archbishop of Rheims, who had dared to pronounce the dissolution of the marriage.<sup>b</sup>

Philip, alarmed at the mutinous movements among the people, at length sent certain ecclesiastics and knights to Rome, to complain of the harsh proceedings of the Legate; to declare himself ready to give sureties that he would abide by the sentence of the Pope. "What sentence?" sternly exclaimed the Pope, "that which has been already delivered, or that which is to be delivered? He knows our decree: let him put away

<sup>a</sup> Addition à la Chronique de St. Denis. ferendam duxerimus, sed terram tan-

<sup>b</sup> "Nec in personam subintroductæ, tum post frequentes commonitiones vel tuam sententiam aliquam pro subjecimus interdicto."—Epist. v. 50

his concubine, receive his lawful wife, reinstate the bishops whom he has expelled, and give them satisfaction for their losses; then will we raise the interdict, receive his sureties, examine into the alleged relationship, and pronounce our decree." The answer went to the heart of Agnes of Meran; it drove the King to fury. "I will turn Mohammedan! happy Saladin, he has no Pope above him!" But without the support of the princes and prelates of the realm even the haughty Philip Augustus must bow. He summoned a parliament at Paris; it was attended by all the great vassals of the crown. Agnes appeared in her beauty, as when she had distributed the prizes of valour at Compiègne; in her sadness (says a chronicler of the day),<sup>p</sup> like the widow of Hector before the Greeks (she was far gone with child). The barons sate mute, not a sword flashed from its scabbard. "What is to be done?" demanded the King. "Obey the Pope, dismiss Agnes, receive back Ingeburga." So appalled were the nobles of France by the Papal interdict. The King turned bitterly to the Archbishop of Rheims, and demanded whether the Pope had declared his dissolution of the marriage a mockery. The prelate denied it not. "What a fool wert thou, then, to utter such a sentence!" The King sent a new embassy to Rome. Agnes of Meran addressed a touching epistle to the Pope. "She, a stranger, the daughter of a Christian prince, had been married, young and ignorant of the world, to the King, in the face of God and of the Church; she had borne him two children. She cared not for the crown, it was

<sup>p</sup> Gul. Brito. I have consulted Capefigue's Philippe Auguste, but with the care with which it is necessary to read that rapid but inexact writer. This, however, was his first and best work. There are some important letters on the subject in Langebek, *Rerum Danicarum Scriptores*.

on her husband that she had set her love. Sever me not from him." The inflexible Pope deigned no reply. Innocent sent the Cardinal of Ostia, a kinsman of the King of France, one of his most trusted counsellors, in compliance with the King's suppliant request, as the Legate to France. His instructions were full and explicit: he was to demand complete satisfaction for the dispossessed clergy, the banishment of the concubine ("the German adulteress" she is called by some of the coarser writers), not only from the palace but from the realm; the public reception of Ingeburga; an oath and sureties to abide by the sentence of the Church. The Cardinals (Octavian of Ostia was accompanied by John of Colonna) were received in France in a kind of trembling yet undisguised triumph; they came to deliver the land from its curse. At Vezelay they were met by the great prelates and clergy of the realm; the King received them at Sens with the utmost respect; he promised satisfaction to the Churchmen, was reconciled to the Bishops of Paris and Soissons. To the King's castle of St. Leger came the cardinals, the prelates; and in their train Ingeburga. The people thronged round the gates: but the near approach of Ingeburga seemed to rouse again all the King's insuperable aversion.<sup>a</sup> The Cardinals demanded that the scene of reconciliation should be public; the negotiation was almost broken off; the people were in wild despair. At last the King seemed to master himself for a strong effort. With the Legates and some of the churchmen he visited her in her chamber. The workings of his countenance betrayed the struggle within: "The Pope does me violence," he said. "His Holiness requires but justice,"

<sup>a</sup> Epist. iii. 140. Apud du Theil.

answered Ingeburga. She was led forth, presented to  
the Council in royal apparel; a faithful knight  
at Sens,  
Sept. 7, 1200. of the King came forward, and swore that the  
King would receive and honour her as Queen of France.  
At that instant the clanging of the bells proclaimed the  
raising of the interdict. The curtains were withdrawn  
from the images, from the crucifixes; the doors of the  
churches flew open, the multitude streamed in to satiate  
their pious desires, which had been suppressed for seven  
months. The news spread throughout France; it  
reached Dijon in six days, where the edict first proclaimed  
was abrogated in form. Nothing, however, could induce  
Philip Augustus to live with Ingeburga as his wife. He  
severed himself from Agnes of Meran, now a third time  
about to become a mother. It is said that at their part-  
ing interview their passionate kisses, sobs, and mutual  
protestations were heard. Her pregnancy was so far  
advanced that she could not leave the kingdom; she  
retired to a castle in Normandy; the serfs were said to  
see her pale form wandering, with wild gestures and  
dishevelled hair, upon the battlements. She brought  
forth a son in sorrow; he received the fitting name of  
Tristan.

The Legates appointed a Council for the solemn  
adjudication of the cause. It was to meet at Soissons  
at a time fancifully fixed at six months, six days, and  
six hours from the date of the summons. The King of  
Denmark and the Archbishop of Lund were cited to the  
support of the cause of the Danish princess. But  
in the mean time, with all outward show of honour,  
Ingeburga was but a more stately prisoner. She com-  
plained to the Pope of the favour shown by the Legate  
to the King: Octavian had been flattered and softened  
by the recognition of his relationship to Philip. Inno-

cent himself addressed the cardinals in language, which delicately suggested his dissatisfaction. If the Pope was not yet content with his victory over the King, the prelates, and clergy, who had refused instantaneous and complete obedience to the interdict, must be punished with the most abject humiliation. The Archbishop of Rheims, the Bishops of Chartres, Orleans, Melun, Noyon, Beauvais, and Auxerre were compelled to appear at Rome (the aged and the infirm were alone permitted to appear by their proctors) to express their contrition and obtain absolution at the feet of the Pontiff. The Pope prohibited the promotion of Hugo, the refractory Bishop of Auxerre, to the Archbischopric of Sens.<sup>r</sup>

The Council of Soissons met at the appointed time in great pomp. The Cardinal Octavian presided <sup>Council of Soissons,  
Mar. 2, 1201.</sup> at first, without awaiting the arrival of the Cardinal of St. Paul. The King entered the city on one side; Ingeburga took up her dwelling in the convent of Notre Dame. She was received with the honours of a Queen. On the side of the King appeared a great number of learned lawyers, who pleaded at considerable length the nullity of the marriage; the Archbishop of Lund and the Danish ambassadors declared that they were present when the messengers of Philip demanded Ingeburga in marriage; having sworn in his name that he would marry her and crown her as soon as she entered his realm. They produced the oath. "We arraign you, King of France! therefore, of perjury, of breach of faith; we appeal from the Lord Octavian, your kinsman, in whom we have no trust, to the Pope." Octavian requested them to await the arrival of the

<sup>r</sup> *Gesta, lvi.*

Cardinal of St. Paul. "We have appealed to the Pope," they said, and departed. But on the arrival of the Cardinal John the cause went on. Ten bishops and several abbots pleaded for Ingeburga. But an unknown champion appeared in the lists, and bore away the prize in defence of the injured beauty, Agnes of Meran. He was an ecclesiastic of unpretending demeanour, but such was the perspicuity, the learning, and the fervour of his speech, that the assembly sate in wonder. He disappeared at the end. So ran the legend of this unknown priest, who came to the rescue of the Queen of France. But there seemed no end to the inexhaustible arguments —they had sat fourteen days; the cardinals, the audience showed signs of impatience: they were strangely and suddenly released. One morning the King rode up to the Council; he declared that he would receive and live with Ingeburga as his wife. At once she was mounted behind him; and the King rode off with his hated spouse through the wondering streets, without bidding farewell to the perplexed cardinals. The Council was at an end. The Cardinal John returned to Rome. The Cardinal Octavian remained in France.

The motive of this extraordinary act of Philip Augustus was unknown in his own days. But in all probability he was informed that his beloved Agnes of Meran was, if not actually dying, not likely to live. Some superstitious fears arising from her death, some remorse which might awaken in the hour of affliction, some desire to propitiate the Church towards the object of his love, and to procure availings prayers for her salvation; above all, that which lay nearest to his heart, and was the object which he pressed most earnestly soon after

her death, the legitimation by the Pope of the children which she had borne him, may have determined the impetuous monarch to this sudden change, if not of feeling, of conduct. To the legitimation of his sons the Pope consented. But whatever his motive, Philip could not, or would not conquer his inconceivable aversion to the person of Ingeburga. To the Pope he declared repeatedly that nothing but witchcraft could be the cause.<sup>t</sup> The Pope, in language somewhat remarkable, urged the King to prepare himself by prayer, by alms, and by the sacrament, in order to dissolve the spell.<sup>u</sup> But in a more dignified letter, he enjoins him at least to treat her with the respect due to the descendant of kings, to the sister of a king, the wife of a king, the daughter of a king. Philip Augustus obeyed not; he eluded even this command. Ingeburga was led from castle to castle, from cloister to cloister; she was even deprived of the offices of religion, her only consolation; her bitter complaints still reached Rome; still new remonstrances were made by Innocent; till her voice seems to have been drowned in the wars of France and England, of Philip Augustus and John; and Innocent in his new function of mediator between or rather dictator to these rival monarchs, seemed to forget the neglected and persecuted Queen. Many years after Philip is said to have made her his Queen in all outward honours, but even then she was not his wife.<sup>x</sup>

<sup>t</sup> See in the Grande Chronique what sur les genoux de la reyne, faisant postures et mines horribles." the monks made of this. "Un vieux clerc" (how came he there?) "avait vu le diable tout rouge . . . folâtrant"      <sup>u</sup> Epist. x. 176.      <sup>x</sup> Grandes Chroniques, sub ann. 1213.

## CHAPTER V.

Innocent and England.<sup>1</sup>

INNOCENT had humbled the ablest and most arbitrary King who had ruled in France since the days of Charlemagne; Philip Augustus had been reduced to elude and baffle by sullen and artful obstinacy the adversary whom he could not openly confront.<sup>a</sup> But beyond the general impression thus made of the awfulness of the Papal power, the contest with Philip led to no great results either in the history of France or of the Church. In England, the strife of Innocent, first with King John, afterwards with the barons and churchmen of England, had almost immediate bearings on the establishment of the free institutions of England. During the reign of John, disastrous, humiliating to the King and to the nation, were laid the deep foundations of the English character, the English liberties, and the English greatness; and to this reign, from the attempt to degrade the kingdom to a fief of the Roman See, may be traced the first signs of that independence, that jealousy of the Papal usurpations, which led eventually to the Reformation.

On the accession of Innocent, so long as Richard lived, England was in close alliance with the Apostolic See. Richard was the great supporter of the Papal claimant of the Empire. At his

<sup>a</sup> Innocent consented to the legitimation of Philip's sons by Agnes of Meran,  
Nov. 2

desire Innocent demanded of Philip, whom he still called Duke of Swabia, as having succeeded to his brother's, the Emperor Henry's, patrimonial domains and treasures, the restitution of the large ransom extorted from Richard. Philip was bound to this act of honour and justice.<sup>b</sup> The Duke of Austria was also threatened with excommunication, if he did not in like manner, for the welfare of his father's soul, who had taken an oath to make restitution, refund his share of the ransom money. The language of Innocent, when he assumes the mediation between France and England, though impartially lofty and dictatorial to both, betrays a manifest inclination towards England. The long account of insults, injuries, mutual aggressions, which had accumulated during the Crusade, on the way to the Holy Land, in the Holy Land, seems to perplex his judgement. But in France Philip Augustus is condemned as the aggressor; and peremptorily ordered to restore certain castles claimed by Richard.<sup>c</sup> But Richard fell before the castle of a contumacious vassal.<sup>d</sup> His brother John, by the last testament of Richard, by the free acclamation of the realms of England and of Normandy, succeeded to the throne. The Pope could not be expected, unsummoned, to espouse the claims of Arthur of Bretagne, the son of John's elder brother; for neither did Arthur nor his mother Constance appeal to the Papal See as the fountain of justice, as the protector of wronged and despoiled princes; and in most of the Teutonic nations so much of the elective spirit and form remained, that the line of direct hereditary succession was not recognised either by strict law or invariable usage. That the cause of Arthur was taken up by

<sup>b</sup> Epist. i. 242.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. i. 230.

<sup>d</sup> Richard died April 6, 1199.

Philip of France, then under interdict, or at least threatened with interdict, was of itself fatal to his pretensions at Rome. But neither towards King John, in whom he hoped to find a faithful ally and a steady partisan of his Emperor Otho, does Innocent arm himself with that moral dignity which will not brook the violation of the holy Sacrament of Marriage: the dissolution of an inconvenient tie, which is denied to Philip Augustus, is easily accorded, or at least not imperiously, or inexorably denied, to John. There was a singular resemblance in the treatment of their wives by these sovereigns; except that in one respect, the moral delinquency of John was far more flagrant; on the other hand, his wife acquiesced in the loss of her royal husband with much greater facility than the Danish princess repudiated by Philip of France. John had been married for twelve years to the daughter of the Earl of Gloucester; an advantageous match for a younger prince of England. On the throne, John aspired to a higher, a royal connexion. He sought a dissolution of his marriage on the plea of almost as remote affinity. The Archbishop of Bordeaux was as obsequious to John as the Archbishop of Rheims had been to Philip Augustus. Negotiations had been concluded for an alliance with a daughter of the King of Portugal, when John suddenly became enamoured of Isabella, the betrothed wife of the Count de la Marche. Isabella was dazzled by the throne; fled with John, and was married to him. Such an outrage on a great vassal was a violation of the first principle of feudalism; from that day the Barons of Touraine, Maine, and Anjou held themselves absolved from their fealty to John. But although this flagrant wrong, and even the sin of adultery, is added to the repudiation of his lawful wife,

no interdict, no censure is uttered from Rome either against the King or the Archbishop of Bordeaux. The Pope, whose horror of such unlawful connexions is now singularly quiescent, confirms the dissolution of the marriage, against which, it is true, the easy Havoise enters no protest, makes no appeal;<sup>e</sup> for John, till bought over with the abandonment of Arthur's claim to the throne by the treacherous Philip Augustus, is still the supporter of Otho: he is the ally of the Pope, for he is the ally of the Papal Emperor.

Philip, embarrassed by his quarrel with the Pope, and the wavering loyalty of his own great vassals, <sup>Contest  
with Philip  
Augustus.</sup> who had quailed under the interdict, though he never lost sight of the great object of his ambition, the weakening the power of England in her Continental dominions and her eventual expulsion, at first asserted but feebly the rights of Arthur to the throne; he deserted him on the earliest prospect of advantage. In the treaty confirmed by the marriage of Louis, the son of Philip, with John's kinswoman, Blanche of Castile, Philip abandoned the claims of Arthur to all but the province of Bretagne; John covenanted <sup>A.D. 1200.</sup> to give no further aid in troops or money to Otho of Brunswick in his strife for the Empire.<sup>f</sup>

But the terrors of the interdict had passed away. Philip Augustus felt his strength: the Barons of Anjou, Touraine, Poitou, Maine, were eager to avenge the in-

\* Epist. v. 19, contains a sort of reproof to John for his propensity to the sins of the flesh, and gently urges repentance; but to the divorce I see no allusion, as Dr. Pauli seems, after Hurter, to do.—Geschichte Englands, p. 304.

<sup>f</sup> See instructions to the Legate, the

Bishop of Ostia, to break the dangerous alliance growing up between the kings of France and England.—Epist. i. 697, and letter to John, urging the support of Otho by money ibid. and i. 714-720. Innocent declared John's oath null and void.

dignity offered to Hugh de la Marche. De la Marche appealed to his sovereign liege lord the King of France John summoned to do homage for redress. Philip summoned John to do homage for Aquitaine ; to answer in his courts of Paris for the wrong done to De la Marche. Nor did John (so complete was the theory of feudal subordination) decline the summons. He promised to appear ; two of his castles were pledged as surety that he would give full satisfaction in the plenary court of his sovereign. But John appeared not ; his castles refused to surrender ; Philip renewed his alliance with Arthur of Bretagne, asserted his claim to all the continental possessions of the King of England, contracted Arthur in marriage with his own daughter, as yet but of tender age. The capture, the imprisonment, the death of Arthur. The capture, the imprisonment, the death of Arthur, raised a feeling of deep horror against John, whom few doubted to have been the murderer of his nephew.<sup>g</sup> Philip of France now appeared in arms under the specious title, not only of a sovereign proceeding against a wrong-doing and contumacious vassal, but as the avenger of a murder perpetrated on his nephew, it was said by some by the hand of John himself.<sup>h</sup> John had been summoned, at the accusation of the Bishop of Rennes, to answer for this crime before the Peers of France at Paris. Again John appeared not ; the Court delivered its sentence, finding John Duke of Normandy guilty of

<sup>g</sup> Wendover at first merely says, "non multo post subito evanuit." "Utinam," adds Matt. Paris, "non at fama refert invida." Radulph de Coggeshal is bolder (he wrote in France). From his relation, through Holinshed, Shakespeare drew his exquisitely pathetic scene.

<sup>h</sup> "Adeo quidem ut rex Johannes suspectus habebatur ab omnibus, quasi illum manu propriâ peremisset, unde multi animos avertentes a rege semper deinceps, ut ausi sunt, nigerrimo ipsum odio perstrinxerunt."—Wendover (ed. Coxe), p. 171.

felony and treason for the murder of the son of his elder brother, a vassal of France, within the realm of France. John had thereby violated his oath of fealty to the King of France, and all the fiefs which he held by that homage were declared forfeited to the Crown. Philip broke into Normandy, and laid siege to Château Gaillard, the key of the province. John, at Rouen, as though to drown his fears or his remorse, indulged, in the society of his young bride, in the most careless and prodigal gaiety, amusement, and debauchery ; affected to despise the force of Philip, and boasted that he would win back in a day all that Philip would conquer in a year. But at the approach of Philip, even before the fall of Château Gaillard, he fled to England. He appealed to the Pope ; he demanded that ecclesiastical censures should be visited on the perjured Philip Augustus, who had broken his oaths to maintain peace. At the commencement of the war Innocent had instructed the Abbot of Casamaggiore to command the adverse monarchs to make peace. “It was his duty to preach peace. How would the Saracens rejoice at the war of two such kings ! He would not have the blood which might be shed laid to his account.” Philip Augustus, at a full assembly of Barons at Nantes, coldly and haughtily replied, that the Pope had no business to interfere between him and his vassal. But he avoided, either from prudence or respect, the reproach that the head of Christendom was standing forward as the protector of a murderer. The reply of Innocent from Anagni was the boldest and fullest declaration of unlimited power which had yet been made by Pope. He was astonished at the language of the King of France, who presumed to limit the power in spiritual things con-

Dec. 6.

High lan-  
guage of  
Innocent.

fferred by the Son of God on the Apostolic See, which was so great that it could admit no enlargement.'

<sup>A.D. 1203.</sup> "Every son of the Church is bound, in case his brother trespasses against him, to hear the Church. Thy brother the King of England has accused thee of trespass against him ; he has admonished thee ; he has called many of his great Barons to witness of his wrongs : he has in the last resort appealed to the Church. We have endeavoured to treat you with fatherly love, not with judicial severity ; urged you, if not to peace, to a truce. If you will not hear the Church, must you not be held by the Church as a heathen and a publican ? Can I be silent ? No. I command you now to hear my legates, the Archbishop of Bourges and the Abbot of Casamaggiore, who are empowered to investigate, to decide the cause. We enter not into the question of the feudal rights of the King of France over his vassal, but we condemn thy trespass—thy sin—which is unquestionably within our jurisdiction. The Decretals, the law of the Empire, declare that if throughout Christendom one of two litigant parties appeals to the Pope, the other is bound to abide by the award. The King of France is accused of perjury in violating the existing treaty, to which both have sworn, and perjury is a crime so clearly amenable to the ecclesiastical courts, that we cannot refuse to take cognisance of it before our tribunal." But Philip was too far advanced in his career of conquest to be arrested by such remonstrances ; nor did the Pope venture on more vigorous interference ; there was no further menace of interdict or excommunication. John, indeed, as the sagacious Innocent may

<sup>Loss of  
Normandy.</sup>

<sup>A.D. 1203.</sup>

have perceived, was lost without recovery—lost by his own weakness, insolence, and unpopularity. His whole Continental possessions were in revolt or conquered by Philip; a great force raised in England refused to embark. He tried one campaign in Aquitaine: some successes, some devastations, were followed by <sup>July 9, 1206.</sup> a disgraceful peace, in which Philip Augustus, having nearly accomplished his vast object, the consolidation of the realm in one great monarchy, condescended to accept the Papal mediation. From that time the King of England ceased to be the King of half France.

Normandy was not yet lost, peace not yet re-established with Philip Augustus, when John was involved in a fierce contention with his ally, Pope Innocent. It arose out of the death of Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury. Who should fill the throne of Thomas à Becket—who held the primacy of England? The question of investitures had hardly reached England, or had died away since the days of Anselm. The right of nominating to the bishoprics remained nominally in the chapters; but as the royal licence was necessary before they could proceed to the election, and the royal approval before the consecration and the possession of the temporalities, the Kings had exercised controlling power, at least over all the greater sees. The Norman kings and the Plantagenets had still filled all the great benefices with Norman prelates, or prelates approved by the Court. Becket himself was, in fact, advanced by Henry II. Some of the English sees had grown out of or were connected with monasteries, which asserted and exercised the rights of chapters. The monks of Christ-church in Canterbury claimed the election to the

A.D. 1205.  
Quarrel with  
the Pope  
about Arch-  
bishopric  
of Canter-  
bury.

Metropolitan See. The monks were at the same time most obstinately tenacious of their rights, and least capable of exercising them for the welfare of the Church and of the kingdom. At this present time there were on one side deep and sullen murmurs that the Church of England had sunk into a slave of the King. Becket had laid down his martyr life in vain.<sup>k</sup> On the other hand, the King rejoiced in the death of Hubert, whom he suspected of secret favour towards his enemy the King of France. The second prelate of the kingdom, Geoffrey Archbishop of York, the brother of the King, had refused to permit a thirteenth, exacted by the King for the recovery of his French dominions, to be levied in his province; he had fled the realm, leaving behind him an anathema against all who should comply with the King's demands.<sup>m</sup> The privilege of the monks of Christchurch in Canterbury to elect the Primate had been constantly contested by the suffragan prelates, who claimed at least a concurrent right of election.<sup>n</sup> At all the recent elections this strife had continued: the monks, though overborne by royal authority, or by the power of the prelates, never renounced or abandoned their sole and exclusive pretensions.

Immediately on the death of Hubert, the younger monks, without waiting for the royal licence, A.D. 1205. in the narrow corporate spirit of monkhood, hastily elected their Sub-prior Reginald to the See. In order to surprise the Papal sanction, under which

<sup>k</sup> "Licet beatus Thomas archiepiscopus animam suam pro ecclesiastice posuerit libertate, nulla tamen utilitas quoad hoc in sanguine ejus erat, quoniam Anglicana ecclesia per principum insolentiam in profunda ser-

vitate ancillata jacebat."—*Gesta, ch. cxxxi. Matt. Par.*

<sup>m</sup> *Wendover, pp. 154-209.*

<sup>n</sup> Compare *Lingard, Hist. of England, in loco.*

they might defy the resentment of the King, without whose licence they had acted, and baffle the bishops who claimed the concurrent right, they had the precaution to take an oath from Reginald to maintain inviolable secrecy till he should arrive at Rome. The vanity of Reginald induced him, directly he reached Flanders, to assume the title, and to travel with the pomp of an Archbishop Elect. On his arrival at Rome, Innocent neither rejected nor admitted his pretensions. Among the monks of Christchurch, in the mean time, the older and more prudent had resumed their ascendancy; they declared the election of Reginald void, obtained the royal permission, and proceeded under the royal influence to elect in all due form John de Gray, Bishop of Norwich, a martial prelate and the great leader in the councils of the King.<sup>o</sup> The suffragan bishops acquiesced in this election. The Bishop of Norwich was enthroned in the presence of the King, and invested in all the temporalities of the see by the King himself.

On the appeal to Rome, upon this question of strict ecclesiastical jurisdiction, all agreed. Reginald the Sub-prior and his partisans were already there; twelve monks of Christchurch appeared on the part <sup>A.D. 1206.</sup> of the King and the Bishop of Norwich; the suffragan bishops had their delegates to maintain their right to concurrent election. The Pope, in the first place, took into consideration the right of election. He decided in favour of the monks. Against their prescriptive, immemorial usage, appeared only pretensions established in irregular and violent times, under the protection of arbitrary monarchs.<sup>p</sup> Many decisions of

• Wendover, p. 194. R. de Coggeshal.

¶ Wendover, p. 188.

the Papal See had been in favour of elections made by the monks alone; none recognised the necessary concurrence of the bishops. Policy no doubt commingled in this decree with reverence for ancient custom; the monks were more likely to choose a prelate of high churchmanlike views—views acceptable to Rome; the bishops to comply with the commands, or at least not to be insensible to the favour of the King.

The Court of Rome proceeded to examine the validity of the late election. It determined at once to annul both that of Reginald the Sub-prior and that of John de Gray: of Reginald, because it was irregularly made, and by a small number of the electors; of De Gray, because the former election had not been declared invalid by competent authority. The twelve monks were ordered to proceed to a new election at Rome. John had anticipated this event, and taken an oath of the monks to elect no one but John de Gray. They

<sup>Stephen Langton.</sup> were menaced with excommunication if they persisted in the maintenance of their oath; they were commanded to elect Stephen Langton, Cardinal of St. Chrysogonus. Innocent could not have found a Churchman more unexceptionable, or of more commanding qualifications for the primacy of England. Stephen Langton was an Englishman by birth, of irreproachable morals, profound theologic learning, of a lofty, firm, yet prudent character, which unfolded itself at a later period in a manner not anticipated by Pope Innocent. Langton had studied at Paris, and attained surpassing fame and honourable distinctions. Of all the high-minded, wise, and generous prelates who have

<sup>A.D. 1207.</sup> filled the see of Canterbury, none have been superior to Stephen Langton; and him the Church of England owes to Innocent III. And if in

himself Langton was so signally fit for the station, he was more so in contrast with his rivals—Reginald, who emerged from his obscurity to fall back immediately into the same obscurity; the Bishop of Norwich, a man of warlike rather than of priestly fame, immersed in temporal affairs, the justiciary of the realm, in whom John could little fear or Innocent hope to find a second Becket. The monks murmured, but proceeded to the election of Langton. Elias of Brantfield alone stood aloof unconsenting; he tried the effect of English gold, with which he had been lavishly supplied. Innocent, it is said, disdainfully rejected a bribe amounting to three thousand marks.<sup>a</sup>

Innocent, aware that this assumption of the nomination to the archbishopric by the Pope, this intrusion of a prelate almost a stranger, would be offensive to the pride of the English King, had endeavoured to propitiate John by a suitable present. Among the weaknesses of this vain man was a passion for precious stones. Innocent sent him a ring of great splendour, with many gems, accompanied with a letter explaining their symbolic religious signification.<sup>r</sup> The letter was followed by another, recommending strongly Stephen Langton, Archbishop elect of Canterbury, as a man incomparable for theologic learning and for his character and manners; a person who would be of the greatest use to the King in temporal or in spiritual affairs. But the messengers of the Pope were stopped at Dover. At Viterbo,<sup>b</sup> the Pope proceeded to the consecration of the Primate of England. The fury of John knew no bounds: he accused the monks of Canterbury of

<sup>a</sup> Wendover, p. 212.

<sup>r</sup> Matt. Par.

<sup>b</sup> Innocent passed the summer and autumn of 1207 at Viterbo.—Hutch. II. p. 39. Rage of King John.

having taken his money in order to travel to Rome, and of having there betrayed him. He threatened to burn their cloister over their heads; they fled in the utmost precipitation to Flanders; the church of Canterbury was committed to the monks of St. Augustine; the lands of the monks of Christchurch lay an uncultivated wilderness. To the Pope he wrote in indignation that he was not only insulted by the rejection of the Bishop of Norwich, but by the election of Langton, a man utterly unknown to him, and bred in France among his deadly enemies. The Pope should remember how necessary to him was the alliance of England; from England he drew more wealth than from any kingdom beyond the Alps. He declared that he would cut off at once all communication between his realm and Rome.<sup>t</sup> Innocent's tone rose with that of John, but he maintained calmer dignity. He enlarged on the writings of Langton: so far from Langton being unknown to the King, John had three times written to him since his promotion to the cardinalate. He warned the King of the danger of revolting against the Church: "Remember this is a cause for which the glorious martyr St. Thomas shed his blood."

John had all the pride, in the outset of this conflict he showed some of the firm resolution, of a Norman sovereign. The Bishop of Norwich, in his disappointed ambition, inflamed the resentment and encouraged the obstinacy of the King. "Stephen Langton at his peril should set his foot on the soil of England."<sup>u</sup> Innocent proceeded with slow but determinate measures. All

<sup>t</sup> The letter in Wendover, 216.— Matt. Paris.

<sup>u</sup> According to the Burton Annals, John threatened to hang the arch-

bishop, "si quo terram meam intraverit, faciam suspendi." In Rolls Publications, p. 210. 1864.

expostulation having proved vain, he armed himself with that terrible curse which had already brought the King of France under his feet. England in her turn must suffer all the terrors of interdict. William Bishop of London, Eustace Bishop of Ely, Mainger Bishop of Worcester, had instructions to demand for the last time the royal acknowledgment of Langton; if refused, to publish the interdict throughout their dioceses.\* The King broke out into a paroxysm of fury; he uttered the most fearful oaths—blasphemies they were called—against the Pope and the Cardinals; he swore “by the teeth of God,” that if they dared to place his realm under an interdict he would drive the whole of the bishops and clergy out of the kingdom, put out the eyes and cut off the noses of all Romans in the realm, in order to mark them for hatred. He threatened the prelates themselves with violence. The prelates withdrew, in the ensuing Lent published the interdict, and then fled the kingdom, and with them the Bishops of Bath and Hereford. “There they lived,” says the historian, “in abundance and luxury, instead of standing up as a defence for the Lord’s house, abandoning their flocks to the ravening wolf.”<sup>y</sup> Salisbury and Rochester took refuge in Scotland.<sup>z</sup> Thus throughout England, as throughout France, without exception, without any privilege to church or monastery, ceased the divine offices of the church. From Berwick to the British Channel, from the Land’s-End to Dover, the churches were closed, the bells silent; the only clergy who were seen stealing silently about were those who

\* See in Rymer a letter of remonstrance by Pope Innocent. John answers the bishop that he will obey the Pope, “salva dignitate regia et libertatibus regiis.”—i. p. 99.

<sup>x</sup> Wendover, p. 224.

<sup>y</sup> Ecwer. Continuat. Fordun. viii.

were to baptise new-born infants with a hasty ceremony ; those who were to hear the confession of the dying, and to administer to them, and to them alone, the holy Eucharist. The dead (no doubt the most cruel affliction) were cast out of the towns, buried like dogs in some unconsecrated place—in a ditch or a dungheap—without prayer, without the tolling bell, without funeral rite. Those only can judge the effect of this fearful malediction who consider how completely the whole life of all orders was affected by the ritual and daily ordinances of the Church. Every important act was done under the counsel of the priest or the monk. Even to the less serious, the festivals of the Church were the only holidays, the processions of the Church the only spectacles, the ceremonies of the Church the only amusements. To those of deeper religion, to those, the far greater number, of abject superstition, what was it to have the child thus almost furtively baptised, marriage unblessed, or hardly blessed ;<sup>a</sup> the obsequies denied ; to hear neither prayer nor chant ; to suppose that the world was surrendered to the unrestrained power of the devil and his evil spirits, with no saint to intercede, no sacrifice to avert the wrath of God ; when no single image was exposed to view, not a cross unveiled : the intercourse between man and God utterly broken off ; souls left to perish, or but reluctantly permitted absolution in the instant of death ?

John might seem to encounter the public misery, not with resolute bravery, but with an insolence of disdain ; to revel in his vengeance against the bishops and priests who obeyed the Pope. The Sheriffs had orders to

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Lingard, from Dunstable, p. 51, says that sermons were preached in the churchyards, marriages and burials performed in the church porch.—vol. iii.

compel all such priests and bishops to quit the realm, scornfully adding that they might seek justice with the Pope. He seized the bishoprics and abbeys, and escheated their estates into the hands of laymen. Some of the monks refused to leave their monasteries; their lands and property were not the less confiscated to the King's Exchequer. All the barns of the clergy were closed and marked as belonging to the royal revenue. The clergy of England were open to persecution of a more cruel nature. The marriage of the clergy still prevailed to a wide extent, under the opprobrious name of concubinage. The King seized these females throughout the realm, and extorted large sums for their ransom. The ecclesiastics, as they would not submit to the King's law, were out of the protection of the King's law; if assaulted on the high road, plundered, maltreated, they sought redress in vain. It was said that when a robber was brought bound before the King who had robbed and slain a priest, John ordered his release: "He has rid me of one enemy." Yet throughout all these oppressions of the Church, three prelates—his minister Peter of Winchester, Gray of Norwich (Deputy of Ireland), and Philip of Durham—were the firm partisans, the unscrupulous executors of all the King's measures.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>b</sup> "Presbyterorum et clericorum focariae per totam Angliam a ministris regis captae sunt et graviter ad se redimendum compulsa."—Wendover, p. 223.

<sup>c</sup> See, on the bishops, the very curious Latin song published by Mr. Wright, 'Political Songs.' Stephen is expected to be a second Becket. "Thomam habes (Cantia) sed alterum. Sed cum habebis Stephanum—Assumes sibi tympanum—Chelyn tangens sub

modulo." Bath is accused of inordinate rapacity as a collector for the king's exchequer. "Tu Norwicensis bestia!—Audi quid dicat veritas—Qui non intrat per ostia—Fur est, an de hoc dubitas?—Heu! cecidisti gravius—Quam Cato quondam tertius; Cum presumpta electio—Justo ruat judicio. Empta per dolum Simonis—Wintoniensis armiger—Præsidet ad Scaccarium—Ad computandum impiger—Piger ad evangelium—Regis

These exactions from the clergy enabled John to conduct his campaigns in Scotland, Wales, and Ireland with success. After above a year Innocent determined to strike at the person of the King, to excommunicate him by name in the most solemn manner. Stephen Langton had obtained a relaxation of the interdict so far that Divine service might be performed once a week in the conventional churches. The Pope issued his commission to the fugitive Bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester to pronounce the sentence of excommunication, and to transmit it for publication to the few prelates who remained in the land. Every Sunday and every feast day it was to be repeated in all the conventional churches of England. Not a prelate dared to undertake the office; the whole clergy were dumb. Yet the awful fact transpired; men whispered to each other that the King was an excommunicated person; it was silently promulgated in market places, and in the streets of the cities. One clergyman, Geoffrey, Archdeacon of Norwich, who was employed in the royal exchequer, was seized with conscientious scruples as to serving an excommunicated King. He retired to Norwich. The King sent after him, ordered him to be loaded with chains, and afterwards cased in a surcoat of lead: he died in prison.

---

revolvens rotulum—Sic lucrum Lu-  
cam superat—Marco, Marcam præ-  
ponderat—Et librae librum subjicit.”  
John (William?) of London, Ely, and  
Worcester (the successor of S. Wulstan),  
are named as the three who are to  
beat down the three impious ones.  
“Ely, parcens paucis vel nemini.”  
Salisbury and Rochester are named  
with more meagre praise.—P. 10,  
*et seqq.* There is a spirited anti-papal

song on the other side. It is chiefly  
on the avarice of Rome—

“Romanorum curia non est nisi forum.”

It does not abstain from the Pope—

“Cum ad Papam veneris, habe pro con-  
stanti,

Non est locus pauperi, soll faveat danti.”

Mr. Wright suggests that the lion in  
the fourth verse means King John—  
a strange similitude!—the bishop  
the asses.

It is remarkable that while the interdict of one year reduced the more haughty and able Philip Augustus to submission, the weak, tyrannical, and contemptible John defied for four years the whole awful effects of interdict, and even for some time of personal excommunication. Had John been a popular sovereign, had he won to his own side by wise conciliation, by respect to their rights, by a dignified appeal to their patriotism, the barons and the people of England ; had he even tempted their worse passions, and offered them a share in the confiscated property of the Church even the greatest of the Popes might have wasted his ineffectual thunders on the land. Above two years after the interdict, and when the sentence of excommunication was well known, King John held his Christmas at Windsor ; not one of the great barons refused to communicate with him ; even later, when Innocent proceeded to release his subjects from their oaths of allegiance, he still counted among his steadfast adherents the three bishops, Henry of Winchester, Philip of Durham, and John of Norwich ; the Chancellor and a great number of the most powerful barons were firm in their loyalty. But while he defied the Pope and the hierarchy, he at the same time seemed to labour to alienate the affections of all orders in the country. He respected no rights ; nothing was sacred against his rapacity or his lust. His profligate habits outraged the honour of the nobles ; his passion for his Queen Isabella had burned out ; not one of the wives or daughters of the highest barons was safe from his seductions or violence : against the lower orders he had re-enacted and enforced with the utmost severity the forest-laws. An obscure person ("a false theologian"), Alexander the Mason, had now found his way into the

Resistance  
of John.

A.D. 1210.

A.D. 1211.

councils of the King. Alexander is charged with encouraging at once the tyrannous and irreligious disposition of the King. He declared that kings were designed by God as scourges of their subjects; that he should govern them with a rod of iron. He averred at the same time that the Pope had no right to interfere in temporal matters; that God had given only ecclesiastical powers to St. Peter. John heaped benefices, which he wrested from their right owners, on this congenial adviser; he was afterwards reduced by the Pope's interposition to the lowest beggary; the clergy triumphed in his misery.<sup>a</sup> The exactions and barbarities of the King against the Jews would move but slight

<sup>A.D. 1210.</sup> sympathy, even if not viewed with approbation: they were seized, imprisoned, tortured, without any avowed charge, with the sole, almost ostentatious design, of wringing money from their obstinate grasp. The well-known story of the Jew who lost his teeth, one every day for seven days, before he would yield, and on the eighth redeemed what were left by ten thousand marks, even if wholly or partly a fiction, is a fiction significant of terrible truth.<sup>b</sup> But the whole people was oppressed by heavy and unprecedented taxation. At length, when time had been given for the estrangement of the nobles and people to grow into disaffection, almost into revolt, Innocent proceeded to that last act of authority which the Papal See reserved against contumacious sovereigns. The Interdict had smitten the land; the Excommunication desecrated the person of the King; the subjects had been absolved from their fealty; there remained the act of deposition from the throne of his fathers. The sentence was pub-

<sup>a</sup> Wendover, p. 229.

<sup>b</sup> Wendover, 231.

licly, solemnly promulgated against the King of England ; his domains were declared the lawful spoil of whoever could wrest them from his unhallowed hands.

A.D. 1213.

There was but one sovereign in Europe whom his own daring ambition, and his hatred of John, might tempt to this perilous enterprise. Philip Augustus, who had himself so bitterly complained of the insolence of the Pope in interdicting his realm, excommunicating his person, absolving his subjects from their fealty, was now religiously moved to execute the Papal sentence of deposition against his rival. He had won the continental dominions, he would possess himself of the insular territories of John. The policy of Pope Innocent with regard to the King of France had undergone a total revolution. Otho, the Emperor, the kinsman of John, who owed to the wealth of John his success in his struggle for, if not his conquest of the Empire, was now the armed enemy of the Pope ; France was the ally of Frederick the Sicilian, whose claims to the Empire were befriended by Innocent. The interests of the Pope and the King of France were as intimately allied as they had been implacably opposed. At a great assembly in Soissons appeared Stephen Langton, the Bishops of London and Ely, newly arrived from Rome, the King of France, April 8, 1213. the bishops, clergy, and people of that realm. The English bishops proclaimed the sentence of deposition ; enjoined the King of France and all others, under the promise of the remission of their sins, to take up arms ; to dethrone the impious King of England ; to replace him by a more worthy sovereign. Philip Augustus accepted the command of this new crusade. Great forces were levied for the invasion of England ; secret

Philip  
Augustus  
undertakes  
to dethrone  
King John.

negotiations carried on with the discontented nobles. The measures of John were not wanting in vigour or subtlety. He raised an immense force, which encamped on Barham Downs. The sheriffs had been ordered to summon every man capable of bearing arms ; every vessel which would hold six horses was to assemble in Portsmouth harbour. He assumed the aggressive, captured some ships at the mouth of the Seine, and burned Fecamp and Dieppe. The army was so vast as to be unwieldy, and could not be supplied with provisions ; but, even reduced, it amounted to 60,000 men.<sup>f</sup> Yet in all that army there were few whom John could trust, except, perhaps, the Irish, 1500 foot and a strong force of cavalry, brought over by his fast friend the Bishop of Norwich, the Deputy of Ireland ; and the Flemish mercenaries, so long as they received their pay. It was <sup>Desperation of King John.</sup> universally believed, it became matter of grave history, that John took a step of still more awful desperation ; the outcast of Christendom would take refuge in Mohammedanism. He meditated a bold revolt to Islam. He despatched a secret embassy to Mohammed el Nasser, the Emir al Mouenim, the Caliph, as he was called, of the Mohammedans of Spain and Africa, offering to embrace the faith of the Korân, to own himself the vassal of the representative of the false prophet. It was still more unaccountably believed that the haughty Mohammedan treated his advances with disdain, and refused to honour the renegade Christian with his alliance. It is true that the abhorrence, the contempt of the Christian world had become allayed rather than inflamed by the Crusades ; noble Christian knights and Christian kings had learned to honour

---

<sup>f</sup> See in Wendover the orders to the sheriffs, p. 244.

chivalry and generosity in their unbelieving foes. The strife of Richard and Saladin had been that of kings who admired the lofty qualities each of his rival; Philip Augustus was said in his wrath to have expressed his envy of the Mohammedan Noureddin, who had no Pope to control him. Frederick II. is about to appear even in more suspicious friendly approximation to the unbeliever. It is more probable that John may, in his impotent passion, have threatened, than had the courage to purpose such act of apostasy. The strong argument against it is his cowardice rather than his Christian faith. Even John must have had the sagacity to see that such alliance could give him no strength: would arm embattled Christendom against him. His anger might madden him to bold words, it would not support him in deliberate acts. But that the story was widely spread, eagerly believed, is of itself a significant historical fact.<sup>g</sup> But the better and wiser hope of John was in detaching the Pope himself, by feigned or by temporary submission, from the head of his own league; in making a separate peace with the Pontiff. He had sent the Abbot of Beaulieu, with five other ecclesiastics, to Rome; they had not been allowed, on account of certain informalities, to proceed in their negotiations; but the Subdeacon Pandulph, an ecclesiastic high in the confidence of Innocent, was commanded to proceed to England as Legate. Without any communication with the King of France, Pandulph presented himself at Dover before King John.<sup>h</sup>

John by this time had passed from the height of in-

<sup>g</sup> Math. Paris, p. 169. Compare Lingard, who is disposed to think the story not incredible.

<sup>h</sup> See the long curious account of this

interview in the Burton Annals, placed at Northampton, not at Dover, and in the year 1211, pp. 209 *et seqq.* Pandulph was not cardinal.

solence to the lowest prostration of fear. Not only did everything tend to deepen his mistrust of his own subjects and his suspicions of the wavering fidelity of his army, but, like most irreligious men, he was the slave of superstition. One Peter, a hermit, had obtained great fame among the people as a prophet: of all his prophecies none had made greater noise, or been received with more greediness, than a saying relating to the King; that before Ascension Day John would cease to be King of England. Peter had been seized and imprisoned in Corfe Castle, and now, just at this perilous crisis, the fatal Ascension Day was drawing on; there wanted but three days. Pandulph was an Italian of consummate ability. He was ushered into the presence of the King by two Knights Templars. His skilful address overawed the shattered mind of John to a panic of humiliation. He described in the most vivid terms the vast forces of the King of France, darkened the disloyalty of the English barons; King Philip had declared that he had the signatures of almost all of them inviting him over.<sup>i</sup> From the hostility of France, of the exiled bishops, of his own barons, he had everything to fear; everything to hope from the clemency of Rome. John, once humbled, knew no bounds to his abject submission; he was as recklessly lavish in his concessions as recklessly obstinate in his resistance. He was not even satisfied with subscribing the hard terms of the

May 15, 1213.

treaty dictated by Pandulph; he seemed to have a desperate determination by abasing himself even below all precedent to merit the strongest protection from that

<sup>i</sup> "Jactat in præterea idem rex chartas habere omnium fere Angliæ magnatum de fidelitate et subjectione." —Wendover, p. 47. Yet John had

great names on his side,—William, Earl of Salisbury, his bastard brother; Reginald, Count of Boulogne; Warennes, de Veres.

irresistible power which he had rashly provoked, and before which he was now bowed down; he could not purchase at too high a price his reconciliation to the See of Rome; perhaps he contemplated, not without satisfaction, the bitter disappointment of his enemy Philip Augustus, in thus being deprived of his prey.

The treaty with the Pope acknowledged the full right of Langton to the Archiepiscopal See; it repealed the sentence of banishment against the clergy, and reinstated them in their functions and their estates; it promised full restitution of all monies confiscated to the royal use, and compensation for other wrongs; a specific sum was to be paid to the Archbishop, and to each of the exiled bishops; it released from imprisonment all who had been apprehended during the contest; it reversed every sentence of outlawry; and guaranteed the clergy for the future from such violent abuse of the power of the Crown. Four barons swore to the execution of these stipulations on the part of the King; the Legate, on that of the Pope, that on their due fulfilment the interdict and the excommunication should be removed; and that the bishops should take a new oath of allegiance. But Ascension Day was not yet passed; it wanted still two days; and during those two days John had unconsciously fulfilled the prediction of the Hermit. On the vigil of that day appeared the Legate in his full pomp in the church of the Templars. Submission  
of John. On the other side entered the King of England, and placed an instrument in the Legate's hands signed, sealed, and subscribed with his own name, with that of the attesting witnesses.—“Be it known to all men,” so ran the Charter, “that having in many points offended God and our Holy Mother the Church, as

satisfaction for our sins, and duly to humble ourselves after the example of him who for our sake humbled himself to death, by the grace of the Holy Ghost, with our own free will and the common consent of our barons, we bestow and yield up to God, to his holy apostles Peter and Paul, to our Lord the Pope Innocent, and his successors, all our kingdom of England and all our kingdom of Ireland, to be held as a fief of the Holy See with the payment of 1000 marks, and the customary Peter's pence. We reserve to ourselves, and to our heirs, the royal rights in the administration of justice. And we declare this deed irrevocable; and if any of our successors shall attempt to annul our act, we declare him thereby to have forfeited his crown." The attesting witnesses were one archbishop (of Dublin), one bishop (De Gray of Norwich), nine earls, among them Pembroke and Salisbury, and four barons. The next day he took the usual oath of fealty to the Pope; he swore on the Gospels. It was the oath of a vassal. "I, John, by the Grace of God, King of England and Lord of Ireland, from this day forth and for ever, will be faithful to God and to the ever blessed Peter, and to the Church of Rome, and to my Lord the Pope Innocent, and to his Catholic successors. I will not be accessory, in act or word, by consent or counsel, to their loss of life, of limb, or of freedom. I will save them harmless from any wrong of which I may know; I will avert all in my power; I will warn them by myself or by trusty messengers, of any evil intended against them. I will keep profoundly secret all communications with which they may entrust me by letter or by message. I will aid in the maintenance and defence of the patrimony of St. Peter, specially this kingdom of England and Ireland, to the utmost of my power, against all

enemies. So help me God and his holy Gospels."<sup>k</sup> Every year, beside Peter's pence, the realm was to pay to the Holy See, as sign of vassalage, 1000 marks—700 for England, 300 for Ireland.

By this extraordinary proceeding it is difficult to decide to what extent, according to the estimation of the time, John degraded himself and the realm of England. His first act showed that he was himself insensible to all its humiliating significance. That first act was to revenge himself on the hermit Peter. Ascension Day passed over; he instantly ordered Peter and his son to be dragged at the tails of horses, and hung on gibbets, as false prophets. But the popular feeling vindicated the truth of the prediction: John had *ceased to reign* by the surrender of his kingdom to the Pope. It was afterwards among the heaviest charges made by Louis of France, when he claimed the crown of England; it followed the accusation of the murder of his nephew Arthur, that John had unlawfully surrendered the realm to the Pope.<sup>m</sup> The attesting witnesses were some of the greatest nobles in the land; they were chiefly the attached partisans of John, the Bishop of Norwich, and the King's bastard brother, Salisbury; Pembroke and Warenne were afterwards among the barons who extorted the great Charter.

Innocent had added, by this act of John, another and a more powerful kingdom to that great feudal monarchy, half spiritual half temporal, which the later Popes had

<sup>k</sup> Compare the copies of the submission and the oath in Wendover with those in Rymer. In Wendover *secundarius* has been substituted (by the copyist) for *feudatorius*.

<sup>m</sup> The passage cited by Dr. Lingard,

that he did this under compulsion from the barons, *coactus*, will bear another interpretation. He was compelled not by the counsel or control of those around him, but by the perfidious league of the others with France.

aspired to found in Rome;<sup>n</sup> that vague and undefined sovereignty which gave the right of interfering submission. in all the affairs of the realm, as Suzerain as well as Spiritual Father. He had succeeded, by accident in truth, and to his loss and discomfiture, in imposing an Emperor on Germany; but still he had fixed a precedent for the decision of the Pope against a majority of the German electors. He held, at least he claimed to hold, the greater part of Italy. He did hold the kingdom of Sicily, as a fief of the Papacy; the patrimony of St. Peter, and the inheritance of the Counts of Tuscany, as actual Lord. In France the Popes asserted the reigning family, the descendants of Hugh Capet, to have received the throne by their award. The Pope had transferred it as from the Merovingian to the Carlovingian: so from the house of Charlemagne to that of Capet. In Spain, the kingdom of Arragon owned feudal allegiance. The Latin Empire of Constantinople, though won in direct prohibition of his commands, was yet subject to his undefined claim of sovereignty. Over all kingdoms conquered from the infidels he asserted his right of disposal, as well as over all islands: England held Ireland by his sovereign grant.

Pandulph had received the fealty of the King of England; the 8000*l.* sterling, which had been stipulated as the compensation for the exiled prelates, had been paid into his hands; he is said likewise to have received a sum of money as the first payment of the tribute to Rome, and to have trampled it contemptuously under his feet. But it was not Pan-

---

<sup>n</sup> During many pontificates the papal bulls and briefs speak of England as a vassal kingdom held of Rome.

dulph's policy to insult further the degraded John and Pandulph was a man who acted throughout from wary policy. It is possible that in order to take a high tone, and remove that suspicion of rapacity which attached to all the proceedings of the Court of Rome, he may have declined to receive these first fruits of his conquest; but what he did carry to France was not the fee-farm payment to Rome, but the restitution money to the English prelates.<sup>o</sup> He appeared before the King of France, and in the name of the Pope briefly and peremptorily forbade him from proceeding to further hostilities against John, who had now made his peace with the Church. Philip Augustus burst into fury. "Had he at the cost of sixty thousand pounds assembled at the summons, at the entreaty of the Pope, one of the noblest armaments which had ever met under a King of France? Was all the chivalry of France, in arms around their sovereign, to be dismissed like hired menials when there was no more use for their services?" His invectives against the Pope passed not only all the bounds of respect, but of courtesy. But the defection of Ferrand Count of Flanders was more powerful in arresting the invasion of England, than the inhibition of Pandulph. Ferrand, whose conduct had been before doubtful, and who had entered into a secret league with the King of England, diverted on his own dominions the wrath of Philip, to whom the more alluring plunder of the rich Flemish towns seemed to offer a conquest more easy and profitable than the realm of England. Flanders, he swore, shall be France, or France Flanders. But the fleets of England joined the Flemings, and the attempted conquest of

<sup>o</sup> Sismondi has confounded the two kinds of payment.

Flanders by Philip Augustus ended in disgraceful discomfiture.

If the dastardly mind of John was insensible to the shame of having degraded his kingdom into a fief of Rome, he might enjoy an ignominious triumph in the result of Philip's campaign. From himself he had averted all immediate danger; he had arrested the French invasion of England, and the menaced revolt of his barons; he had humbled his implacable enemy by his successes in Flanders. He had secured an ally, faithful to him in all his subsequent tyrannies, humiliations, and disasters. The vassal of the Roman See found a constant, if less powerful protector, in his lord the Pontiff of Rome. As elate in transient success as cowardly in disaster, John determined to resume the aggressive; to invade his ancient dominions in Poitou. But he was still under excommunication (Pandulph had prudently reserved the absolution till John had fulfilled the terms of the treaty by the reception of the exiled prelates). The barons refused to follow the banner of the kingdom, raised by an excommunicated monarch.

July 20, 1213. St. Margaret's Day. John was compelled to fulfil his agreement to the utmost; to drink the dregs of humiliation. The exiled prelates, Stephen of Canterbury, William of London, Eustace of Ely, Hubert of Lincoln, Giles of Hereford, landed at Dover; they proceeded to Winchester:<sup>¶</sup> there they were met before the gates by John; he fell at their feet and shed tears. The prelates raised him up, mingling, it is said, their tears with his; they conducted him into the church; they pronounced the absolution. King John swore on the Gospels to defend the Church and the priesthood; he swore also to

re-establish the good laws of his predecessors, especially those of King Edward; to abrogate the bad laws; to judge every man according to his right. He swore also to make ample restitution, under pain of a second excommunication, of all which he had confiscated during the exile of the prelates. He again swore fealty to the Pope and his Catholic successors.

John, now free from ecclesiastical censures, embarked for Poitou in the full hope that the realm of England would follow him in dutiful obedience. Most of the barons stood sullenly aloof; those who embarked abandoned him at Jersey. This was the first overt act in the momentous strife of the Barons of England for the liberties of England, which ended in the signature of the great Charter; and at the head of these Barons was Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury. Henry II. when he raised Becket to the Primacy of England, in order by his means to establish the temporal supremacy of the King over the Church, had not more completely mistaken the character of the man, than Innocent when he raised Langton to the same dignity, to maintain all the exorbitant pretensions of Rome over England. Langton, a more enlightened churchman, remembered not only that he was an Archbishop, but that he was an Englishman and a noble of England. He had asserted with the Pope the liberties of the Church against the King; he asserted the liberties of England against the same King, though supported by the Pope. Almost the first act of Langton was to take the initiative in the cause of the barons. John returned from Jersey in fury against the contumacious nobles; he declared his determination to revenge himself, he summoned troops to execute his vengeance. Langton sought him at Northampton, and remonstrated at his arming against his

barons before they had been arraigned and found guilty in the royal courts, as a violation of the oath sworn before his absolution. The King dismissed him with scorn, commanding him not to meddle in state affairs. But Langton followed John to Nottingham; threatened to excommunicate every one who should engage in this war before a fair trial had taken place, excepting only the King himself.<sup>a</sup> The King sullenly consented to convoke a plenary court of his nobles. One meeting of the Primate and the nobles had taken place at St. Alban's; a second, ostensibly to regulate the claims of the Church upon the crown, was convened in St. Paul's, London. Langton there produced to the barons the charter of Henry I.; the barons received it with loud acclamations, and took a solemn oath to conquer or die in defence of their liberties.<sup>r</sup>

At Michaelmas arrived the new legate, Nicolas Cardinal of Tusculum: his special mission was the settlement as to the amount to be paid by the king for the losses endured by the clergy. He was received, though the interdict still lingered on the realm till the king should have given full satisfaction, with splendid processions.<sup>s</sup> His first act was to degrade the Abbot of Westminster, accused by his monks of dilapidation of their estates, and of incontinence. The citizens of Oxford were condemned for the murder of two clerks (not without provocation): they were to present themselves at each of the churches of the city naked to their shirts, with a scourge in their hand, and to request absolution, reciting the fiftieth psalm, from the parish priest. The Cardinal, who travelled at first with seven horses,

<sup>a</sup> Wendover, p. 261.

<sup>r</sup> Wendover, p. 263. See the charter.  
<sup>s</sup> Wendover, p. 275.

had soon a cavalcade of fifty. The amount of just compensation to the clergy it was impossible to calculate. Their castles had been razed, their houses burned, their orchards and their woods cut down. John offered the gross sum of 100,000 marks. The legate urged its acceptance, but was suspected of favouring the King. The bishops received in advance 1500 marks, and the affair was for the present adjourned. On the payment of this sum the interdict was raised, but what further compensation was awarded to the inferior claimants does not appear. Still meeting after meeting took place, at length the business was referred to the Pope, who awarded to the Archbishop, the Bishops of London and Ely, the sum of 40,000 marks. At St. Paul's the King gave greater form and pomp to his disgraceful act of vassalage.<sup>t</sup> Before the high altar, in the presence of the clergy and people, John deposed his crown in the hands of the Legate, and made the formal resignation of the kingdom of England and Ireland.<sup>u</sup> The golden seal was affixed to the deed of demission and consigned to the Pope. John did actual homage to the Legate for the kingdom of England. It was said that Stephen Langton had protested even at Winchester against this act of national humiliation. But if Langton bore this second act in silence, it was manifest that he had fallen in the favour of the Pope. The Pope was determined to support his vassal, whatever his iniquities, vices, crimes. Langton had

Second surrend  
er of  
the realm.

<sup>t</sup> "Illa non formosa sed famosa sub-  
jectio."—M. Paris.

<sup>u</sup> "Archiepiscopo conquerente et re-  
clamante."—M. Paris. But the words  
are not in Wendover. Could it be the  
Archbishop of Dublin? The French  
translator of Matthew Paris, Mons.

Huillard Breholles, would transfer  
these complaints as if spoken at Dover,  
to this second transaction. This is  
taking great liberty with a text; but  
it is clear that they were not made by  
Stephen Langton at Dover; he had  
not then arrived in England.

now openly espoused the cause of his country's liberties. The Legate was empowered, without consulting the Primate or the Bishops, to appoint to all the vacant benefices; he travelled through the country attended by the royal officers and the clergy attached to the King; he filled the churches with unworthy men, or men at least thought unworthy; he suspended many ecclesiastics, and tauntingly told them to carry their complaints to Rome, while he seized their property and left them nothing to defray the expenses of their journey.\* He trampled on the rights of patrons, and appointed his own clerks, many probably foreigners, to English preferments. His progress, instead of being a blessing to the land, was deemed a malediction. His final raising of the interdict was hardly a compensation for his insolent injustice. The Pope no doubt shared in the unpopularity of these proceedings. Stephen Langton the Primate summoned a council of his bishops at Dunstable; and sent certain priests to inhibit the Legate from inducting prelates and priests within the realm. Both appealed to the Pope. The Legate sent the politic Pandulph, Stephen Langton Simon his bold brother, who afterwards held the archbishopric of York in despite of Papal prohibition, to the court of Innocent. But the charter of John's submission weighed down all the arguments of Simon Langton.<sup>†</sup>

The great battle of Bouvines in Flanders, which annihilated the hopes of the Emperor Otho, and placed the Count of Flanders, as a prisoner, at the July 23, 1214. mercy of the merciless Philip Augustus, recalled John from Poitou, where he had made a vigorous,

\* "Spreto archepiscopi et episcoporum regni consilio."—Wendover, p. 277  
† Wendover, p. 279.

and for a time successful descent. He returned discomfited, soured in temper, to confront his barons, now prepared for the deadly strife in defence of their liberties. Throughout the contest, so long as he was in England, the Primate maintained a lofty position. With the other higher clergy he stood aloof from the active contest, though he was known to be the real head of the confederacy. He was not present at the great meeting at St. Edmondsbury ; he appeared not in arms ; he does not seem to have left the court ; the demand for the charter of Henry I. came entirely from the lay barons. On the presentation of that address he consented, with the Bishop of Ely and William Mareschal Earl of Pembroke, to be the king's sureties that he would hear and take into consideration the demands of his subjects,\* and satisfy, if he might, their discontents. While the appeal to arms was yet in suspense, John, with that craft which in a nobler mind might have been wise policy, endeavoured to detach the church from the cause of the national liberties. The clergy had been indemnified for their losses, but still there was an old and inveterate grievance, the despotic power exercised by the Norman princes in the nomination to vacant bishoprics and abbacies. On the rare occasions in the early part of his reign, when he gave the royal licence for the election of a bishop or great abbot, the electors were summoned before the king ; an election in the royal presence was not likely to be against the royal will. During the interdict John's revenge (it was probably the source of the enormous wealth which he had at his command) had seized the revenue of these un-

Meeting at  
St. Edmonds-  
bury.

A.D. 1214.

Address.  
Epiphany,  
1215.

filled benefices. On his reconciliation with the Roman See, elections were to be in his presence, whether he were in England or on the continent. This he relaxed only on the remonstrance of the Archbishop, to permit them to take place, during his absence, before commissioners. But still the nomination was virtually in him, and him alone. He was now seized with an access of pious liberality, granted a charter of free election to all chapters and conventional churches: the charter declared that the royal licence would always be granted; if not granted, was no bar to the free election; he renounced all royal influence, and promised the royal approbation unless the King could allege lawful objection.\* That he might secure still further the protection of the church, John took the cross, and declared his intention to proceed, when relieved from his pressing cares, to the recovery of the Holy Land.

Each party endeavoured to obtain the support of Rome. The barons had aided powerfully the cause of the Church in the former contest, and now the Church, at least the Primate, made common cause with the barons. But Innocent reserved his gratitude for the vassal who had laid the crown of England at his feet. "We must maintain the rights of, repel all insurrection against, a king who is our vassal."<sup>b</sup> In truth he understood the nature, no more than he foresaw the remote consequences of the conflict. That the Church should resist, control, dictate to the temporal sovereign, was in

\* The document is in Rymer.

<sup>b</sup> Such were the plain words of a memorable letter of Pope Innocent (published by Prynne from the original in the Tower, p. 28). He adds: "Contra dominum suum arma movere

temeritate nefariâ præsumpserunt quodque nefandum est et absurdum cum ipse rex quasi perversus Deum et Ecclesiâ offendebat, illi assistebant eidem, cum autem conversus Deo et Ecclesiâ satisfecit, ipsum impugnare præsumunt."

the order of things : that other subjects should do the same, whatever the iniquities of the sovereign or the invasion of their natural or chartered rights, unless in defence of the Church, bordered on impiety. Langton received a severe rebuke ; he was accused as the secret ringleader in this rebellion ; he was commanded to labour for the reconciliation of the king and his subjects. The barons were censured for daring to attempt to extort privileges by force from the crown—privileges to be obtained only as a free gift from the King ; the Pope condescended to promise his good offices in their behalf, if they humbled themselves before their sovereign. Of his sole authority the Pope annulled all their leagues and covenants. The Pope rebuked, censured, promised in vain.

Arms must decide the strife. At the great meeting of the barons at Brackley, Langton and the Earl of Pembroke (the Bishop of Ely was now dead) again appeared in the King's name to receive the final demands of the barons. So high were their demands, that the king exclaimed in a fury : “ They may as well ask my kingdom ; think they that I will be their slave ? ” But though the barons failed before Northampton, Bedford and London opened their gates. The great barons Pembroke, Warenne, and many others who had still appeared at least to be on the king's side, joined Fitz-walter and his party, the Northern Barons as they were called. London was the head-quarters of the King's adversaries. The whole realm was one. The King was compelled to submit to the great Charter. Magna  
Charta  
1215, June 15. Among the witnesses to that Charter, the first were Stephen Archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry Archbishop of Dublin. The first article guaranteed

---

• Wendover, p. 298.

the rights of the Church, not indeed more strongly than the charter before granted by the King, and which had received the ratification of the Pope. The Papal envoy Pandulph was present at the august ceremony. Pope Innocent saw in this movement only the turbulence of a few factious barons; he received the representations of John's ambassadors with great indignation; he knit his brow (so writes the historian), and broke out into the language of astonishment:<sup>a</sup> "What! have the barons of England presumed to dethrone a King who has taken the cross, and placed himself under the protection of the Apostolic See? Do they transfer to others the patrimony of the Church of Rome? By St. Peter, we cannot leave such a crime unpunished." If such unseemly language was attributed to the Pope, the formal acts of Innocent might almost justify such reports of his conduct. In his Bull<sup>e</sup> he attributes the rebellion of the barons, after John had been reconciled to the Church, to the enemy of mankind. He is astonished that the barons have not humbly brought their grievances before his tribunal, and implored redress. The act describes the conduct of the King as throughout just, conciliatory. "Vassals, they have conspired against their Lord—knights, against their king: they have assailed his lands, seized his capital city, which has been surrendered to them by treason. Under their violence, and under fears which might shake the firmest man, he has entered into a treaty with the barons; a treaty not only base and ignominious, but unlawful and unjust; in flagrant violation <sup>Condemned  
by Pope  
Innocent.</sup> and diminution of his rights and honour. Wherefore, as the Lord has said by the mouth of his prophet,—'I have set thee above the nations, and

<sup>a</sup> Wendover, p. 313.

Rymer, i. p. 135.

above the kingdoms, to pluck up and to destroy, to build up and to plant ;' and by the mouth of another prophet,—‘break the leagues of ungodliness, and loose the heavy burthens ;’ we can no longer pass over in silence such audacious wickedness, committed in contempt of the Apostolic See, in infringement of the rights of the King, to the disgrace of the kingdom of England, to the great peril of the Crusade. We therefore with the advice of our brethren, altogether reprove and condemn this charter, prohibiting the king, under pain of anathema, from observing it, the barons from exacting its observation ; we declare the said charter, with all its obligations and guarantees, absolutely null and void.”<sup>f</sup>

The letter of Innocent to the Barons was no less lofty and commanding. He informed them that as they refused all just terms offered by the King, and a fair judgement in the court of Rome, the King had appealed to him his liege lord. He urged them to make a virtue of necessity, themselves to renounce this inauspicious treaty, to make reparation to the King for all losses and outrages perpetrated against him, “so that the King, appeased by their reverence and humility, might himself be induced to reform any real abuses.” “For if we will not that he be deprived of his right, we will not have you oppressed, nor the kingdom of England, which is under our suzerainty, to groan under bad customs and unjust exactions.” They were summoned to depute representatives to the court of Rome, and await the final decision of that tribunal.

The Great Charter of the liberties of England was absolutely, peremptorily annulled, by the supreme

<sup>f</sup> Dated Anagni, Aug. 4.

authority of the Pope, as Pope and as liege lord of the realm. The King was absolutely released from his oath to the statute ; the King threatened with anathema if he observed, the barons if they exacted the observance.<sup>g</sup> Still the rebukes, promises, threats of spiritual censure, the annulling edict, were received with utter disregard by the sturdy barons. They retorted the language of the Scripture, the phrase of Isaiah is said to have been current among them,—“Woe unto him who justifieth the wicked for reward !”

The war had broken out ; the King, with the aid of two of his warlike bishops, the Chancellor-Bishop War. of Worcester, and John de Gray of Norwich, had levied hosts of mercenary troops in Flanders ; free-booters from all quarters, from Poitou and other parts of France, crowded to win the estates of the English barons, which were offered as rewards for their valour. John was pressing the siege of Rochester, which the remissness of the barons allowed to fall into his hands. He was only prevented by the prudence of one of his foreign captains, who dreaded reprisals, from ordering a general massacre of the garrison. The bull of excommunication against the barons followed rapidly the abrogation of the Charter. It was addressed to Peter Bishop of Winchester, the Abbot of Reading, and the Papal Envoy. It expressed the utmost astonishment and wrath, that Stephen Archbishop of Canterbury, and his suffragans, had shown such want of respect to the Papal mandate and of fidelity to their King ; that they had rendered him no aid against the disturbers of the peace ; that they had been privy to, if not actively engaged in

---

<sup>g</sup> Magna Charta the Pope describes as “compositionem non solum vilem et turpem, verum etiam illicitam et ini-

quam, in nimiam diminutionem et derogationem sui juris pariter et honoris.” The documents in Rymer, sub ann.

the rebellious league. "Is it thus that these prelates defend the patrimony of Rome; thus that they protect those who have taken up the cross? Worse than Saracens they would drive from his realm a King in whom is the best hope of the deliverance of the Holy Land." All disturbers of the King and of the realm are declared to be in the bonds of excommunication; the Primate and his suffragans are solemnly enjoined to publish this excommunication in all the churches of the realm, every Sunday and festival, with the sound of bells, until the barons shall have made their absolute submission to the King. Every prelate who disobeys these orders is suspended from his functions.

The Bishop of Winchester, the Abbot of Reading, and Pandulph in a personal interview with the Primate communicated the injunctions of the Pope. Stephen Langton demanded delay; he was about to proceed to Rome, being summoned to attend the Lateran Council. He firmly refused to publish the excommunication, as obtained from the Pope by false representations.<sup>h</sup> The Papal Delegates declared the Primate suspended from his office, and proceeded to promulgate the sentence of excommunication. The sentence was utterly without effect. An incident of the time shows how strongly the sympathies of the clergy were with Langton. The Canons of York, after a long vacancy of the archbishopric,<sup>i</sup>

<sup>h</sup> "Dissensiones . . . dissimulastis hactenus, et conniventibus oculis pertransitis . . . nonnullis suspicantibus . . . quod vos illis præbitis auxilium et favorem."—Rymer, sub ann. 1215. John had complained to the Pope: "Dominus vero Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus et ejus suffraganei mandata vestra executioni de-

mandare supersederunt . . . Archiepiscopus respondens, ut quod sententiam excommunicationis in eos nullo modo proferret qui bene sciebat mentem vestram."—Langton agreed, however, if John would revoke his orders for his foreign mercenaries, to pronounce the excommunication.—Rymer 1215.

<sup>i</sup> From 1212.

rejecting Walter de Grey Bishop of Worcester, the Chancellor and partisan of John, chose Simon Langton, the brother of the Primate. Two brothers, for the first and last time, held these high dignities.

<sup>A.D. 1215.</sup> The Pope, it is true, prohibited the elevation of Langton; but his election was a defiance of the King and of the Pope. The Primate, strong in the blameless dignity of his character, in the consciousness that he was acting as a Christian prelate in opposing a lustful, perfidious, and sanguinary tyrant like John, in his dignity as Cardinal of the Roman Church, feared not to confront the Pope, and to present himself at the <sup>Nov. 1215.</sup> great Lateran Council. The favour, however, <sup>Stephen at Rome.</sup> with which the Pontiff and the Council heard his accusers, the envoys of King John, the Abbot of Beaulieu, Thomas of Herdington, and Geoffrey of Cramonde, the unbending severity of the Pope himself, covered him, it is said, with confusion; at least taught him the prudence of silence: the sentence of suspension was solemnly ratified by Pope and Council, and even when it was subsequently relaxed, it was on the condition that he should not return to England. Stephen Langton remained at Rome though not in custody, yet no less a prisoner. The Canons of York were informed that the Pope absolutely annulled the election of Simon Langton; they were compelled to make a virtue of necessity, to affect joy at being permitted to elect the Bishop of Worcester, a man they acknowledged, it should seem, of one rare virtue—unblemished chastity. De Grey returned Archbishop of York, but loaded with a heavy debt to the Court of Rome, 10,000*l.* sterling.<sup>k</sup>

---

<sup>k</sup> Wendover, p. 346. He adds:—"Itaque accepto pallio episcopus memoratus obligatur in curia Romana de decem millibus libris legalium sterlinae."

When John let loose his ferocious hordes of adventurers from Flanders, Brabant, Poitou, and other countries, like wild beasts upon his unhappy realm; when himself ravaged in the north, his bastard brother the Earl of Salisbury in the south; when the whole land was wasted with fire and sword: when plunder, murder, torture, rape, raged without control; when agriculture and even markets had absolutely ceased, the buyers and sellers met only in churchyards, because they were sanctuaries;<sup>m</sup> when the clergy were treated with the same impartial cruelty as the rest of the people, John was still the ally, the vassal, under the special protection of the Pope. These terrible triumphs of his arms were backed by the sentence of excommunication against the barons and all their adherents.<sup>n</sup> Many of the noblest barons were anathematised by name; above all, the citizens of London and the Cinque Ports, for the capital boasted itself as the head-quarters of the champions of freedom. The citizens of London, however, treated the spiritual censure with utter contempt; the services went on uninterrupted, and exactly in the usual manner, in all the churches.

So also when the Barons in their desperation offered the crown to Louis, the son of Philip Augustus of France. The Legate Gualo, then on his way to England, solemnly warned Louis not to dare to invade the patrimony of St. Peter, a menace not likely to awe a son of Philip Augustus with such a prize before him. Louis indeed showed a kind of mockery of deference to the Pope, in submitting to the Holy See a statement of the

<sup>m</sup> Wendover, p. 351.

<sup>n</sup> Wendover, p. 353. The three sets of excommunication against the barons, of suspension against Stephen Langton, the special anathema on certain barons, with their names, are in Rymes.

title which he set up to the throne of England.<sup>o</sup> This rested on the right of his Queen, even if the house of Castile had any claim, a younger daughter of that house. Its first postulate was the absolute exclusion of John, as attainted for murder during the reign of his brother Richard, and incapable thereby of inheriting the crown ; and for the murder of his nephew, of which he had been found guilty in the court of the King of France. With the original flaw in the title of John fell of course his right to grant the island to St. Peter ; and so the claim of Louis to the throne was an abrogation of that of Innocent to the suzerainty of the land. No wonder then that the sentence of excommunication was launched at once against Louis himself, and all who should invite, assist, support his descent upon England.<sup>p</sup> The last act of Innocent was to command an excommunication as solemn

<sup>July 18, 1216.</sup> of the King of France himself, for guiltily con-  
niving at least at an invasion of England, to be pronounced at a great synod at Melun. The French prelates interposed delay ; and the death of Pope Innocent suspended for a time the execution of this mandate.

The death of Innocent was followed in but a few months by that of John, under fierce affliction for the loss of his baggage and part of his wild freebooting army, which had remorselessly ravaged great part of the kingdom, by sudden floods, as he passed from Lynn in Norfolk into Lincolnshire. John reached the Abbey of Swineshead. Intemperate indulgence in fruit excited his fever ; he there made his will,<sup>p</sup> left his young son to

<sup>o</sup> See Rymer for the document in which Louis alleged his title to the throne of England. Louis asserts the truth of the account, that Archbishop Hubert publicly announced that on the

accession of John “ non ratione successio-  
nis, sed per electionem ipsum in regem  
coronabat.”—Rymer, sub ann. 1216.

<sup>p</sup> The attesting witnesses to his will were the Cardinal Legate Gualo, the

the tutelage of the new Pope Honorius III., and dragged his weary and exhausted body to Newark. There he died in peace with the Church, having received the holy Eucharist, commanding his body and his soul to the intercession of the pious St. Wulstan in Worcester, under the tutelar shade of whose cathedral he wished his ashes to repose. John died in peace with the Church, it was of course believed with Heaven, leaving Stephen Langton the Primate, a Cardinal of the Church, suspended from his holy functions, in a kind of stately disgrace, an exile from his See; the greater part of the higher clergy under virtual excommunication <sup>Oct. 19.</sup> as communicating with the proscribed barons; almost the whole nobility under actual excommunication, and so in peril of eternal perdition.

Thus closed the eventful reign of the meanest and most despicable sovereign who ever sat on the throne of England. Political passions, the pride of ingenuity, the love of paradox, have endeavoured to lighten the burthen of obloquy which has weighed down the memory of most of our least worthy sovereigns. Richard III. has found an apologist; but John has been abandoned utterly, absolutely, to execration and contempt. Yet from the reign of John dates, if not the first dawn, the first concentrated power of the liberties of England. A memorable example of the wonderful manner in which Divine Providence overrules the worst of men to its noblest and most beneficent designs! From this time, too, the impulses of religious independence began to stir in the hearts of men. The national English pride had been

deeply wounded by the degradation of the realm to a fief of the See of Rome; and the ambition of Rome had overleaped itself.<sup>4</sup> Future Popes were tempted to lay intolerable taxation upon the clergy, which was felt by the whole kingdom; and to inflict the almost more intolerable grievance, the filling up the English benefices by foreign ecclesiastics—if not resident, hated as draining away their wealth without condescending to regard any duties; if resident, hated still more profoundly for their pride, ignorance of the language, and uncongenial manners. Our history must show this gradual alienation and estrangement of the national mind from the See of Rome, the silent growth of Teutonic freedom.

<sup>4</sup> The historians, all ecclesiastics, are undenial witnesses. We have heard Wendover. Westminster describes the charter of surrender as “omnibus eam audientibus lugubrem et iestabilem.”—Ann. 1218, p. 98.

Knighton says, “De libero fecit se servum, de dominante servientem, terraque Anglicanam quæ solebat esse libera et ab omni servitute quieta, fecit tributariam et ancillam pedissequam.” —De event. Angliæ, 1. ii. c. 25.

## CHAPTER VL

Innocent and Spain.

THE three great Sovereigns of Western Europe, the Kings of Germany, of France, and of England, had seen their realms under Papal interdict, themselves under the sentence of excommunication; but the Papal power under Innocent not only aspired to humble the loftiest: hardly one of the smaller kingdoms had not already been taught, or was not soon taught, to feel the awful majesty of the Papacy. From the Northern Ocean to Hungary, from Hungary to the Spanish shore of the Atlantic, Innocent is exercising what takes the language of protective or parental authority, but which in most cases is asserted by the terrible interdict. The sunshine of Papal favour is rarely without the black thunder-clouds looming heavily over the land, breaking or threatening to break, in all their wrath. Nowhere is he more constantly engaged, either as claiming feudal sovereignty, as regulating the ecclesiastical appointments, as, above all, the arbiter in questions of marriage, than among the sovereigns of the petty kingdoms of Spain. These kingdoms had gradually formed themselves out of conquests from receding Mohammedanism. Spanish Christianity was a perpetual crusade; and the Head of Western Christendom might still watch with profound anxiety these advances, as it were, of Christendom. There was nothing to prevent another inroad from Africa, ruled by powerful Mohammedan potentates;

nothing, till the great battle of Navas de Tolosa, to guarantee Western Christendom from a new invasion as terrible as that under Tarik. A second battle of Tours

<sup>July 16,</sup> <sub>1212.</sub> might be necessary to rescue Europe from the dominion of the Crescent. Innocent had the happiness to hear the tidings of Navas de Tolosa, where the Crescent fell before the united armies of the three Kings of Castile, Arragon, and Navarre. To each of the Peninsular kingdoms—Portugal, Leon, Castile, Arragon, and Navarre—Innocent speaks in the tone of a master; each, except perhaps Arragon, is in its turn threatened with interdict, his one ordinary means of compulsion.

Portugal had been formed into a Christian State by <sup>Henry of</sup> <sub>Portugal.</sub> the valour of a descendant of the house of Capet; it had been organised by the wisdom of his son Sancho. The Popes had already asserted the strange pretension that territories conquered from the Unbelievers were at their disposal, and that they had the power of raising principalities into kingdoms. Alexander III. had advanced Portugal to that dignity on condition of an annual tribute to the See of Rome. The payment was irregularly made, if not disclaimed. Innocent instructs his Legate, the Brother Rainer, a man of great discretion and trust, employed on all the affairs of Spain, to demand the subsidy; if refused, to compel it by the only authority—ecclesiastical censure. The King of Portugal is to be reminded that he may expect great temporal as well as spiritual advantage from his filial submission to the Supreme Pontiff; but if God is offended by the withholding their rightful dues from other churches, how much more grievous a sin, how heinous a sacrilege is it, to deprive of its full rights the Church which is the mistress of all

Churches!<sup>a</sup> In the same arbitrary manner, and by the same means, Rainer was to compel the Kings of Portugal and Castile to maintain a treaty of peace, on which they had agreed, and to resist the intrigues of turbulent men, who endeavoured to plunge them again into war.

In the affairs of Leon and Castile Innocent interposed in his character as supreme arbiter on all questions of marriage. On the death of Alfonso the Emperor,<sup>b</sup> the great kingdom of Leon had been divided between his two sons, the Kings of Leon and Castile, Fernando and Sancho. The second generation was now on each throne; both the princes bore the name of Alfonso. But instead of urging the war against the common enemy, the Unbeliever, these princes had turned their arms against each other. Alfonso of Leon had married the daughter of the King of Portugal. These sovereigns were connected by some remote tie of consanguinity; the incestuous union was declared void. Cœlestine III. placed under interdict the two kingdoms of Portugal and Leon, and the marriage, though Teresa had borne him three children (one son and two daughters), was absolutely annulled. The repudiated Teresa returned to her native Portugal.<sup>c</sup> But Alfonso of Leon broke off this wedlock only <sup>The King of Leon.</sup> to form another more obnoxious to the ecclesi-  
astical canons. He married Berengaria, the daughter of his cousin-german the King of Castile. The nobles of both realms rejoiced in this union, as a guarantee for peace between Castile and Leon. They would entertain

<sup>a</sup> Epist. i. 99, 449.    <sup>b</sup> Mariana, xi. . . unde quod illegitimè factum erat. est penitus revocatum."—Epist. ii. 75, <sup>c</sup> Innocent's language is express as to the revocation of the marriage: "Verum dictus Rex Legion. ad dete "Filiam . . . Portugalliae regis, in- riora manum extendens."—Compan cestuose præsumperat copulare . . . Mariana, xi. 17.

no doubt that the Papal dispensation might be obtained for a marriage, though within the prohibited degrees, yet by no means offensive to the natural feelings in the West, and of so much importance in directing the united arms of Leon and Castile against the Mohammedans. But to this deviation from the sacred canons the Pope Cœlestine had expressed his determination not to accede ; he sent the Cardinal Guido of St. Angelo to prohibit this second profane wedlock. The Cardinal was to pronounce the interdict against both realms, excommunication against both Sovereigns, unless the hateful contract were annulled. Under this sentence were included, as abettors of the sin, the Archbishop of Salamanca, the Bishops of Zamora, Astorga, and Leon. The Bishop of Oviedo was persecuted by the King of Leon, as inclined to obey the Pope rather than his temporal sovereign.<sup>a</sup> Innocent was not likely to be indulgent where his predecessor had been severe. To this marriage he applies the strongest terms of censure : it is incestuous, abominable to God, detestable in the sight of man. The Brother Rainer is ordered to ratify in the most solemn manner the interdict of the kingdoms, the excommunication of the Kings. Rainer cited the Kings to appear before him. The King of Leon paid no regard to the summons ; the King of Castile averted the interdict for a time by declaring his readiness to receive back his daughter. But he had no intention to restore certain castles which he had obtained as her dowry. The Archbishop of Toledo and the Bishop of Palencia on the part of the King of Castile, the Bishop of Zamora on that of the King of Leon, appeared in Rome. They could hardly obtain a hearing from the inexorable

---

<sup>a</sup> Epist. i. 38, 97, 125.

Pontiff. But their representations of the effects of the interdict enforced the consideration of the Pope. They urged the danger as to the heretics. When the lips of the pastors of the people were closed, the unrefuted heretics could not be controlled by the power of the King. New heresies spring up in every quarter. How great, too, the danger as to the Saracens ! The religious services and the religious sermons alone inflamed the valour of the people to the holy war against the misbelievers; their devotion, now that both prince and people were involved in one interdict, waxed cold. Nor less the danger as to the Catholics, for since the clergy refused their spiritual services, the people refused their temporal payments; offerings, first-fruits, tithes, were cut off; the clergy were reduced to beg, to dig, or, worse reproach, to be the slaves of the Jews. The Pope, with great reluctance, consented to relax the severity of the interdict, to permit the performance of the sacred offices, except the burial of the dead in consecrated ground; this was granted to the clergy alone as a special favour. But the King himself was still under the ban of excommunication; whatever town or village he entered, all divine service ceased; no one was to dare to celebrate an act of holy worship. This mandate was addressed to the Archbishop of Compostella and to all the bishops of the kingdom of Leon.<sup>e</sup>

But his wife had been still further endeared to the King of Leon by the birth of a son;<sup>f</sup> and so regardless were the Leonese clergy of the Papal decree, that the baptism of the child was celebrated publicly with the utmost pomp in the cathedral church of Leon. Innocent

<sup>e</sup> Epist. ii. 75.

<sup>f</sup> The son by Teresa had died in infancy. *Mariana, loc. cit.*

had compared together the royal line of the East and of the West. In the East, Isabella, the heiress of the kingdom of Jerusalem, had contracted two incestuous marriages within the prohibited degrees. God had smitten with death her two husbands, Conrad of Montferrat and Henry of Champagne. He would even inflict

worse vengeance on the transgressors of the West,  
<sup>A.D. 1199.</sup> if they persisted in their detestable deed. His vaticination was singularly unfortunate. The son of this unblessed union grew up a king of the most exemplary valour, virtue, and prosperity; and after his death the canonised Ferdinand was admitted into the holy assembly of the Saints. Nor was it till Berengaria had borne five children to Alfonso of Leon that her own religious scruples were awakened, and she retired from the arms of her husband to a peaceful retreat in the dominions of her father. The ban under which the kingdom had laboured for nearly five years was annulled; the five children were declared legitimate and capable of inheriting the crown. The dispute concerning the border castles was arranged by the intervention of the bishops.

The King of Navarre had incurred the interdict of  
<sup>A.D. 1204.</sup> Innocent on more intelligible grounds. He  
<sup>King of Navarre.</sup> had made an impious treaty with the Infidels; he had even undertaken a suspicious visit to the Miramolin in Africa; he was supposed to be organising a league with the Mohammedans both of Spain and Africa against his enemies the Kings of Arragon and Castile: on him and on his realm Brother Rainer was at once to pronounce the ban, and to give lawful power to the King of Arragon to subdue his dominions. Sancho of Navarre, however, averted the subjugation of the realm: he entered into a treaty with the allied Kings of Arragon and Castile. It was stipulated in the terms

of the treaty that Pedro of Arragon should wed the sister of Navarre. But again was heard the voice of the Pope, declaring that the marriage, though the pledge and surety of peace, and of Sancho's loyalty to the cause of Christendom, being within the third degree of consanguinity, could not be. The oath which Sancho had taken to fulfil this stipulation was worse than perjury; it was to be broken at all cost and all hazard.<sup>s</sup>

But thus inexorable to any breach of the ecclesiastical canons, so entirely had these canons usurped the place of the higher and immutable laws of Christian morals, here, as in the case of John of England, Innocent himself was, if not accommodating, strangely blind to the sin of marriage contracted under more unhallowed auspices. Pedro of Arragon was the model of Spanish chivalry on the throne. He aspired to be the leader of a great crusading league of all the Spanish kings against the Unbelievers. Innocent himself had the prudence to allay for a time the fervour of his zeal. The court of Pedro, like that of his brother, the Count of Provence, was splendid, gay, and dissolute: the troubadour was welcome, with his music and his song, to the joyous prince and the bevy of fair ladies, who were not insensible to the gallant King or to the amorous bards. But Pedro, while he encouraged the gay science of Provence, was inexorable to its religious freedom. He was hitherto severely orthodox, and banished all heresy from his dominions under pain of death. The kingdom flourished under his powerful rule: the King's peace was proclaimed for the protection of widows and orphans, roads and markets, oxen at the plough and all agricultural implements, olive-

<sup>s</sup> Epist. i. 556. Compare Abarca: *Annales de Aragon*, xviii. 7.

trees, and dovecotes. The husbandman found a protector, his harvests security, under the King's rule.<sup>h</sup>

The Kings of Arragon had never been crowned on their accession; they received only the honour of knighthood. From Counts of Barcelona, owing allegiance to the descendants of Charlemagne, they had gradually risen to the dignity of Kings of Arragon. But the last sign of kingship was wanting, and Pedro determined to purchase that honour from the hand which assumed the power of dispensing crowns: he would receive the crown at Rome from the Pope himself, and, as the price of this condescension, hesitated not to declare the kingdom of Arragon feudatory to the See of Rome, and to covenant for an annual tribute to St. Peter. On his journey to Rome he visited his brother at his court in Provence. The beauty and the rich inheritance of Maria, the only daughter of the Count of Montpellier, whose mother was Eudoxia, the daughter of the Emperor of the East, attracted the gallant and ambitious Pedro. There was an impediment to the marriage, it might have been supposed, more insuperable than the ties of consanguinity. She was already married, and had borne two children, to the Count of Comminges;<sup>i</sup> she afterwards, indeed, asserted the nullity of this marriage, on the plea that the Count of Comminges had two wives living at the time of his union with her. But the easy Provençal clergy raised no remonstrance. Innocent, if rumours reached him (he could hardly be ignorant),

<sup>h</sup> Hurter, p. 598.

<sup>i</sup> "Si bien Doña Maria de Mompeller fue en *santidad y valor* ornamento de el estado de Reynas, y traia en dote tan ricos y oportunos pueblos." Abarca, indeed, says, "Ella

ni era hermosa ni doncella." He adds that she had been forced to this marriage, neither legitimate nor public, with the Count of Comminges; see also on her two daughters, and the count's two wives—i. p. 225.

closed his ears to that which was not brought before him by regular appeal. The espousals took place at Montpellier,<sup>k</sup> and Pedro set forth again for Rome. He sailed from Marseilles to Genoa, from Genoa to Ostia. He was received with great state: two hundred horsemen welcomed him to the shore; the Senator of Rome, the Cardinals, went out to meet him; he was received by the Pope himself in St. Peter's; his lodging was with the Canons of that church.

Three days after took place the coronation of the new feudatory king (thus was an example set to the King of England) in the Church of San Pancrazio beyond the Tiber, in the presence of all the civilians, ecclesiastical dignitaries of Rome, and of the Roman people.<sup>m</sup> He was anointed by the Bishop of Porto, and invested in all the insignia of royalty—the robe, the mantle, the sceptre, the golden apple, the crown, and the mitre. He swore this oath of allegiance:—“I, Pedro, King of Arragon, profess and declare that I will be true and loyal to my lord the Pope Innocent, and to his Catholic successors in the See of Rome; that I will maintain my realm in fidelity and obedience to him, defend the Catholic faith, and prosecute all heretical pravity; protect the liberties and rights of the Church; and in all the territories under my dominion maintain peace and justice. So help me God and his Holy Gospel.”

The King, in his royal attire, proceeded to the Church of St. Peter. There he cast aside his crown and sceptre, surrendered his kingdom into the hands of the Pope, and received again the investiture by the sword,

<sup>k</sup> He soon repented of his ill-sorted marriage. Abarca says he set off “para salir el bien de ellos (desvios de el Rey con la Reyna); y alexarse mas de ella,” and hoped to get a divorce from the Pope.

<sup>m</sup> St. Martin's day. Gesta, a. 120.

presented to the Pope. He laid on the altar a parchment, in which he placed his realm under the protection of St. Peter; and bound himself and his successors to the annual tribute of two hundred gold pieces.<sup>n</sup> So was Arragon a fief of the Roman See; but it was not without much sullen protest of the high-minded Arragonese. They complained of it as a base surrender of their liberties; as affording an opening to the Pope to interfere in the internal affairs of the kingdom with measures more perilous to their honour and liberty. Their discontent was aggravated by heavy burthens laid upon them by the King. They complained that in his private person he was prodigal, and rapacious as a ruler. When these proceedings were proclaimed at Huesca they were met with an outburst of reprobation, not only from the people, but from all the nobles and hidalgos of the kingdom.<sup>o</sup> Pedro of Arragon will again appear as Count of Montpellier, in right of his wife, if not on the side of those against whom the Pope had sanctioned a crusade on account of their heretical gravity; yet as the mortal foe, as falling in battle before the arms, of the leader of that crusade, Simon de Montfort.

The lesser kingdoms of Europe, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, those on the Baltic, were not beyond the sphere of Innocent's all-embracing watchfulness, more especially Bohemia, on account of its close relation to the Empire. The Duke of Bohemia had dared

March 1,  
1201.

to receive the royal crown from the excommunicated Philip.<sup>p</sup> The Pope lifts up his voice in solemn

<sup>n</sup> They bore the Moorish name of Massimute, from th<sup>e</sup> King Jussuf Massemut; each was worth six solidi.

• Mariana, lib. xi. p. 362. "Solo

alegre para los Romanos; y despues infeliz y triste para los Aragoneses. Abarca, King Pedro did not succeed in getting rid of his wife.

P Epist. i. 707.

rebuke. The Bohemian shows some disposition to fall off to Otho; the great prelates of Prague and Olmutz are ordered to employ all their spiritual power to confirm and strengthen him in that cause. Hopes are held out that Bohemia may be honoured by a metropolitan see.

To the King of Denmark Innocent has been seen as the protector of his injured daughter; throughout, Denmark looks to Rome alone for justice and for redress. Even Thule, the new and more remote Thule, is not inaccessible to the sovereign of Christian Rome. We read a lofty but affectionate letter addressed to the bishops and nobles of Iceland.<sup>a</sup> A legate is sent to that island. They are warned not to submit to the excommunicated and apostate priest Swero, who aspired to the throne of Norway. Yet, notwithstanding the Pope, Swero the apostate founded a dynasty which for many generations held the throne of Norway.

The kingdom of Hungary might seem under the special protection of Innocent III.: it was his aim to urge those warlike princes to enter on the Crusades. Bela III. died, not having fulfilled his vow of proceeding to the Holy Land. To his elder son Emeric he bequeathed his kingdom; to the younger, Andrew, a vast treasure, accumulated for this pious end, and the accomplishment of his father's holy vow. Andrew squandered the money, notwithstanding the Pope's rebukes, on his pleasures; and then stood up in arms against his bro-

<sup>a</sup> Epist. i. On all these minor transactions, for which I have not space, Hurter is full and minute. Hurter, I think, is an honest writer; but sees all the acts <sup>x</sup> Innocent

through a haze of admiration, which brightens and aggrandises them. Never was the proverb more fully verified, proselytes are always enthusiasts.

ther for the crown of Hungary. His first insurrection ended in defeat. The Pope urged the victorious Emeric to undertake the Crusade; yet the Pope could not save Zara (Jadara), the haven of Hungary on the Adriatic from the crusaders, diverted by Venice to the conquest. Andrew, ere long, was again in arms against his royal brother; the nobles, the whole realm were on his side; a few loyal partisans adhered to the King. Emeric advanced alone to the hostile van; he threw off his armour, he bared his breast; "who will dare to shed the blood of their King?"<sup>r</sup> The army of Andrew fell back, and made way for the King, who confronted his brother. He took the rebel by the hand, and led him away through his own hosts. Both armies broke out in loyal acclamations. Andrew was a prisoner, and sent to a fortress in Croatia. Emeric, before he undertook the Crusade, would have his infant son Ladislaus crowned: a few months after, he was dying, and compelled to entrust his heir to the guardianship of his rebel brother. Ere long the mother and her royal son were fugitives at Vienna; but the timely death of the infant placed the crown on the head of Andrew. After some delay, Andrew atoned in the sight of the Pope for all the disobedience and ambition of his youth, by embarking at the head of a strong Hungarian army for the Holy Land. The King of Hungary could not overawe the fatal dissensions among the Christians, which thwarted every gallant enterprise. He returned after one ineffective campaign. Yet Andrew of Hungary left behind him the name of a valiant and prudent champion of the Cross. He returned to his kingdom

<sup>r</sup> Compare Mailath, *Geschichte der Magyaren*, especially for the striking scene of Emeric in the army of his brother.—v. i. p. 141. A.D. 1203.

in the year of Innocent's death.\* The Golden Bull, the charter of the Hungarian liberties, was the free and noble gift of Andrew of Hungary.

Innocent extended his authority over Servia, and boasted of having brought Bulgaria, even Armenia (the Christian Crusader's kingdom), under the dominion of the Roman See.

---

\* A.D. 1216. On Andrew's crusade see Michaud and Wilken, *in loc.* Brequigny ii. 487, 489.

## CHAPTER VII.

Innocent and the East.

INNOCENT III., thus assuming a supremacy even more extensive than any of his predecessors over the East.<sup>Innocent and</sup> the kingdoms of the West, was not the Pontiff to abandon the East to its fate ; to leave the sepulchre of Christ in the hands of the Infidels ; to permit the kingdom of Jerusalem, feeble as it was, to perish without an effort in its defence ; to confess, as it were, that God was on the side of Mohammedanism, that all the former Crusades had been an idle waste of Christian blood and treasure, and that it was the policy, the ignominious policy of Christendom to content itself with maintaining, if possible, the nearer frontier, Sicily and Spain.

Yet the event of the Crusades might have crushed a less lofty and less religious mind than that of Innocent to despair. Armies after armies had left their bones to crumble on the plains of Asia Minor or of Galilee ; great sovereigns had perished, or returned discomfited from the Holy Land. Of all the conquests of Godfrey of Bouillon remained but Antioch, a few towns in Palestine, and some desert and uncultivated territory. The hopes which had been excited by the death of Saladin, and the dissensions between his sons and his brother, Melek al Adhel, had soon been extinguished. The great German Crusade, in which the Archbishops of Mentz and of Bremen, the

Bishops of Halberstadt, Zeitz, Verden, Wurtzburg, Passau and Ratisbon, the Dukes of Austria, Carinthia and Brabant, Henry the Palgrave of the Rhine, Herman of Thuringia, Otho Margrave of Brandenburg, and many more of the great Teutonic nobles had joined, had ended in disgraceful failure. The death of the Emperor Henry gave them an excuse for stealing back ignominiously, single or in small bands, to Europe; they were called to take their share in the settlement of the weighty affairs of the Empire; the Archbishop of Mentz lingered to the last, and at length, he too turned his back on the Holy Land. The French, who had remained after the departure of Philip Augustus, resented the insufferable arrogance of the Germans; the Germans affected to despise the French. But their only achievement, as Innocent himself tauntingly declared, had been the taking of undefended Berytus; while the Unbeliever boasted that he had stormed Joppa in the face of their whole host, with infinite slaughter of the Christians. All was dissension, jealousy, hostility. The King of Antioch was at war with the Christian King of Armenia. The two great Orders, the only powerful defenders of the land, the Hospitallers and the Templars, were in implacable feud. The Christians of Palestine were in morals, in character, in habits, the most licentious, most treacherous, most ferocious of mankind. Isabella, the heiress of the kingdom, had transferred the short-lived sceptre to four successive husbands. It rested now with Amalric, King of Cyprus. Worst of all, terrible rumours were abroad of suspicious compliances, secret correspondences, even secret apostasies to Mohammedanism, and not only of single renegades. If those rumours had not begun to spread concerning the dark dealings of the Templars with

forbidden practices and doctrines, which led during the next century to their fall, Innocent himself had to rebuke their haughty contempt of the Papal authority. In abuse of their privilege, during times of interdict, whenever they entered a city, they commanded the bells to ring and the divine offices to be publicly celebrated. They impressed with the sign of the cross, and affiliated to their order for a small annual payment of two or three pence, the lowest of mankind, usurers and other criminals, and taught them that, as of their order, whether they died in excommunication or not, they had a right to be buried with the rites of the Church in consecrated earth: it was said that the guilty, licentious and rapacious order wore not the secular garb for the sake of religion, but the garb of religion for the sake of the world.\*

But the darker the aspect of affairs, the more firmly throughout his Pontificate seemed Innocent to be persuaded that the Crusade was the cause of God. Among his first letters were some addressed to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and to Conrad of Mentz with the Crusaders of Germany. In every new disaster, in every discomfiture and loss, the Popes had still found unfailing refuge in ascribing them to the sins of the Christians: and their sins were dark enough to justify the strongest lan-

<sup>Innocent urges the Crusade.</sup> guage of Innocent. To the Patriarch he pledges himself to the most earnest support, exhorts him and his people to prayer, fasting, and all religious works. It needed but more perfect faith, more

\* “Dum utentes doctrinis dæmoniorum in cujusque tructanni pectore Crucifixi signaculum imprimunt . . . asserentes quod quicunque duobus vel tribus denariis annuis collatis eisdem,

se in eorum fraternitatem contulerint, carere de jure nequeant ecclesiasticā sepulturā etiamsi interdicti.”—Epist. x. 121. This letter belongs to the year 1208.

holiness, and one believer would put to flight twelve millions; the miracles of God against Pharaoh and against the Philistines would be renewed in their behalf. For the first two or three years of Innocent's Pontificate, address after address, rising one above another in impassioned eloquence, enforced the duty of contributing to the Holy War. In the midst of his contest with Markwald, his strife concerning the Empire, his interdict against the King of France, he forgot not this remoter object. This was to be the principal, if not the exclusive theme of the preaching of the clergy.<sup>b</sup> In letters to the Bishop of Syracuse, to all the Bishops of Apulia, Calabria and Tuscany, he urges them to visit every city, town, and castle; he exhorts not only the nobles, but the citizens to take up arms for Jesus Christ. Those who cannot assist in person are to assist in other ways, by furnishing ships, provisions, money. Somewhat later came a more energetic epistle to all archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, and princes and barons of France, England, Hungary, and Sicily. He spoke of the insulting language of the enemies of Christ.<sup>c</sup> "Where," they say, "is your God, who cannot deliver you out of our hands? Behold, we have defiled your sanctuaries. We have stretched forth our arm, we have taken at the first assault, we hold, in despite of you, those your desirable places, where your superstition had its beginning. We have weakened and broken the lances of the French, we have resisted the efforts of the English, we have repressed the strength of the Germans. Now, for a second time we have conquered the brave Spaniards. Where is your God? Let him arise and protect you and himself." The Pope bitterly

<sup>b</sup> Epist. i. 302.

<sup>c</sup> Epist. i. 336.

alludes to the campaign of the Germans, the capture of defenceless Berytus, the loss of well-fortified Joppa. The Vicar of Christ himself would claim no exemption from the universal call; he would, as became him, set the example, and in person and in estate devote himself to the sacred cause. He had, therefore, himself invested with the cross two cardinals of the Church, who were to precede the army of the Lord, and to be maintained, not by any mendicant support, but at the expense of the Holy See. The Cardinal Peter was first to proceed to France, to settle the differences between the Kings of England and France, and to enlist them in the common cause; the Cardinal Soffrido to Venice,

<sup>Contribu-</sup> to awaken that powerful Republic. After the <sup>tions</sup> required. Pope's example, before the next March, every archbishop, bishop, and prelate was to furnish a certain number of soldiers, according to his means, or a certain rate in money for the support of the crusading army. Whoever refused was to be treated as a violator of God's commandments, threatened with condign punishment, even with suspension. To all who embarked in the war Innocent promised, on their sincere repentance, the remission of all their sins, and eternal life in the great day of retribution. Those who were unable to proceed in person might obtain the same remission in proportion to the bounty of their offerings and the devotion of their hearts. The estates of all who took up the cross were placed under the protection of St. Peter. Those who had sworn to pay interest for sums borrowed for these pious uses were to be released from their oaths; the Jews were especially to be compelled by all Christian princes to abandon all their usurious claims on pain of being interdicted from all commercial dealings with Christians. "If the soldiers of the Cross,

so entering on their holy course, should walk in the way of the Lord, not as those before them, in revellings and drunkenness, and in licentious indulgences in foreign lands, of which they would have been ashamed at home, they would trample their enemies down as mice under their feet."

But Christendom heard the address of the Pope with apathy approaching to indifference. So utterly might the fire seem extinct, which on former occasions ran wild through Europe, and such was the jealousy which had been raised of the rapacity of the Roman court, that sullen murmurs were heard in many parts, that all this zeal was but to raise money for other ends; that only a small part of the subsidies levied for the defence of the Holy Land would ever reach their destination. Nor was this the suspicion of the vulgar alone, it seems to have been shared by the clergy.<sup>d</sup> The Pope was compelled to stand on his defence; to repel the odious charge, to disclaim all intention that the money was to be sent to Rome; to appoint the bishop of each diocese with one Knight Templar, and one Knight of St. John, as the administrators of this sacred trust.<sup>e</sup>

More than a year elapsed; the supplications for aid from King Amalric and King Leo of Armenia, from the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem became more urgent. Innocent found it necessary to make a stronger and more specific appeal to the sluggish and unawakened clergy. On the last day of the <sup>General taxation.</sup> century issued forth a new proclamation to the arch-

<sup>d</sup> Walter der Vogelweide, Badulf de Diceto. Compare Wilken, p. 80.

<sup>e</sup> "Non est ab aliquo præsumendum, ut ea, quæ a fratribus et coepis-  
topis nostris, et tam prælatis quam

subditis ecclesiarum, in opus tam  
pium erogari mandavimus, propriis  
velimus usibus applicare, aut aliorum  
eleemosynas cupiditate quadam terræ  
sanctæ subtrahere."—Epist. i. 409.

bishops, bishops, and prelates of Tuscany, Lombardy,  
 Dec. 31. Germany, France, England, Hungary, Sclavonia,  
<sup>1199.</sup> Ireland, Scotland. The Pope and his cardinals,  
 and the clergy of Rome, had determined in this pressing  
 exigency, to devote a tenth of all their revenues to the  
 succour of the Holy Land. All prelates and clergy in  
 Latin Christendom were summoned to contribute at  
 least a fortieth to this end. But they were assured  
 that this was not intended as a permanent tax, it was a  
 special burthen not to be drawn into precedent. How  
 criminally hard-hearted he<sup>f</sup> who should refuse so small  
 a boon in this hour of need to his Creator and Re-  
 deemer! These funds were to be deposited in a safe  
 place, the amount notified to Rome. From this en-  
 forced contribution were exempted the Cistercian and  
 Carthusian monks, the Præmonstratensian canons, and  
 the hermits of Grandmont: it was left to their devout  
 hearts to fulfil their part in the common sacrifice; but  
 it was suggested that not less than a fiftieth could be  
 just; and there was a significant menace that they  
 would be deprived of all their privileges, if they were  
 slow and sparing in their offerings. In like manner all  
 Christian people were to be called upon incessantly, at  
 masses appointed for the purpose. In every church  
 was to be an alms'-chest with three keys, one held by  
 the bishop, one by the parson of the parish, one by a  
 chosen laic. The administration was committed to the  
 Bishops, the Knights of the Hospital, and those of the  
 Temple. These alms were chiefly designed to maintain  
 poor knights who could not afford the voyage to the  
 Holy Land; but for this they were to serve for a year  
 or more, and obtain a certificate of such service under

<sup>f</sup> "Sciat autem se culpabiliter durum et dure culpabilem."—Epist. ii. 270.

the hand of the King and the Patriarch of Jerusalem, of the Grand Masters of the Templars and of the Hospitallers, and one of the Papal Legates. If they died or fell in battle, what remained of their maintenance was to be assigned to the support of other soldiers of the Cross.

The demands of the Pope met with no opposition, yet with but scanty compliance. At the Council of Dijon, held concerning the interdict of the King of France, by Peter, Cardinal of Capua, the clergy voted not a fortieth but a thirtieth of their revenue to this service : but the collection encountered insurmountable difficulties ; and Innocent found it necessary to address a still sterner rebuke to the clergy of France. “Behold, the crucified is crucified anew ! he is again smitten, again scourged ; again his enemies take up their taunting reproach, ‘If thou be the Son of God, save thyself ; if thou canst, redeem the land of thy birth from our hands, restore thy cross to the worshippers of the cross.’ But ye, I say it with grief, though I ask you again and again, will not give me one cup of cold water. The laity, whom you urge to assume the cross by your words, not by your acts, take up against you the words of Scripture, ‘They bind heavy burthens upon us, but themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.’ Ye are reproached as bestowing more of God’s patrimony on actors than on Christ ; as spending more on hawks and hounds than in His aid ; lavish to all others, to Him alone sparing, even parsimonious.”<sup>g</sup>

But Richard and Philip of France suspended not their animosities ; and hardly was Richard dead when the interdict fell upon France. Germany was distracted with

the claims of the rival Emperors. It needed more than the remote admonitions of the Holy See to rekindle the exhausted and desponding fanaticism of Christendom. Without a Peter the Hermit, or a St. Bernard, Urban II. and Eugenius III. would not have precipitated Europe upon Asia. The successor of these powerful preachers, it was hoped, had appeared in Fulk of Neuilly.<sup>h</sup> Already

<sup>Fulk of Neuilly.</sup> had Fulk of Neuilly displayed those powers of devout eloquence, which work on the contagious religious passions of multitudes. The clergy of Paris and its neighbourhood were not famous for their self-denial, and Fulk of Neuilly had been no exception to the common dissoluteness. He had been seized, however, with a paroxysm of profound compunction ; he was suddenly a model of the severest austerity and devout holiness. He became ashamed of his ignorance, especially of the Holy Scriptures ; he, a teacher of the people, wanted the first elements of instruction. He began to attend the lectures of the learned men in Paris, especially of the celebrated Peter the Chanter. With style and tablet he noted down all the vivid and emphatic sentences which he heard ; he taught to his parishioners on Sunday what he had learnt during the week. He wrought unexpected wonders on the minds of his simple hearers : his fame spread ; he was invited to preach in neighbouring churches. He himself was hardly aware of his powers, till on a memorable sermon preached in the open street, that of Chaupel, in Paris, to a crowd of clergy and laity, his hearers suddenly began to tear off their clothes, to throw away their shoes, to cast themselves at his feet, imploring

---

<sup>h</sup> Ranulf de Coggeshalle and James de Vitry are most full on Fulk of Neuilly ; the other authorities, in Michaud, Wilken, and Hurter.

him to give them rods or scourges to inflict instant penance on themselves. They promised to yield themselves up to his direction. Everywhere it was the same; usurers laid down their ill-gotten gains at his feet; prostitutes forswore their sins and embraced a holy life. But it should seem, that the first passion for his preaching died away; the public mind had become more languid, and Fulk of Neuilly retired to the diligent and faithful care of his own flock at Neuilly.

Just at this time died his teacher, Peter the Chanter. On that eloquent man Innocent had relied for the effective preaching of the Crusade in France; with his dying lips Peter bequeathed his mission to Fulk of Neuilly. With this new impulse the fervid preaching of Fulk kindled to all its former energy and power. He now, in his zeal for the cross, assailed higher vices—the somnolence of the prelates, the unchastity of the clergy; he denounced the popular heresies; many were converted from their errors; over a softer class of sinners he again obtained such influence, that from the gifts which flowed in to him on all sides, he gave to some marriage portions, for others he founded the convent of St. Anthony in Paris as a refuge from the world. His reputation reached Rome. Soon after his accession, Innocent wrote a letter highly approving the holy zeal of Fulk, urged him to devote all his exertions to the sacred cause, to choose some both of the Black and White Monks, with the sanction of the Legate Peter of Capua, as his assistants, and thus to sow the good seed through the breadth of the land.<sup>i</sup>

Again Fulk of Neuilly set out from place to place; he was everywhere hailed as the worthy successor of

---

<sup>i</sup> Epist. i. 398. Villehardouin.

Peter the Hermit. The wonders which he wrought in the minds and hearts of men were believed to be accompanied by miraculous powers of healing and of blessing. But in the display of his miraculous powers, the preacher showed prudence and sagacity. Some he healed instantaneously; to others he declared that their cure would be prejudicial to their salvation, and, therefore, displeasing to God; others must wait the fitting time, they had not yet suffered long enough the chastening discipline of the Lord. He blessed many wells, over which chapels were built and long hallowed by popular veneration. Before the close of the year, full of fame as the preacher of the cross, Fulk of Neuilly attended the great meeting of the Cistercian Order, and himself took the cross with the Bishop of Langres. Yet the Order declined to delegate any of their body as attendants of the preacher. They gave him, however, a multitude of crosses to distribute, which were almost snatched from his hands by the eager zeal of his followers, as he left the church. The news spread that, like Peter the Hermit, he was about himself to head a crusade; thousands flocked around him, but he would only receive the poor as his followers; he declined the association of the rich.

He pursued his triumphant career with the full sanction of his Bishop, through Normandy and Brittany, Burgundy and Flanders, everywhere preaching the crusade, everywhere denouncing the vices of the age avarice, usury, rapacity. Nobles, knights, citizens, serfs, crowded around him; they took the cross from his hands, they gazed in astonishment at his miracles; their zeal at times rose to an importunate height; they tore his clothes from him to keep the shreds as hallowed reliques. Fulk seems to have been somewhat pas-

sionate, and not without humour. Once, a strong and turbulent fellow being more than usually troublesome, he shouted aloud that he had not blessed his own garments, but would bless those of this man. In an instant the zeal of the multitude was diverted; they fell upon the man, tore his whole dress in tatters, and carried off the precious shreds. Sometimes he would keep order by laying about him vigorously with his staff; those were happy who were wounded by his hallowed hands; they kissed their bruises, and cherished every drop of blood shed by his holy violence. At the close of three years Fulk of Neuilly could boast, in another assembly of the Cistercian Order, that 200,000 persons had received the cross from his hands.

Yet, as before, the eloquence of Fulk of Neuilly wanted depth and intensity; its effects were immediate and violent, but not lasting. It might be, that he either disdained or neglected those ostentatious austeries, which to the vulgar are the crowning test of earnestness. He wore, indeed, a sackcloth shirt next his skin, and kept rigidly the fasts of the Church; but on other occasions he ate and drank, and lived like other men. He was decently shaved, wore seemly attire, he did not travel barefoot, but on an easy palfrey. It might be that his reserve in working miracles awoke suspicion in some, resentment in others who were disappointed in their petitions. But the deep and real cause of his transitory success, was the general jealousy which was abroad concerning the misapplication of the vast funds raised for the service of the Holy Land. Offerings had streamed to him from all quarters; he had received vast subsidies: these he devoted to supply the more needy knights, who took the cross, with arms and provisions for their pilgrimage. But the rapacity

of Rome and of the clergy had settled a profound mistrust throughout mankind: like Innocent, Fulk was accused of diverting these holy alms to other uses.<sup>k</sup> From the time that he began to receive these lavish offerings, the spell of his power was broken; as wealth flowed in, awe and respect fell off. He did not live to witness the crusade of which, even if his motives were thus with some clouded by suspicion, he had been the great preacher; he died of a fever at Neuilly in the year 1202. The large sums which he had deposited in the abbey of the Cistercians were faithfully applied to the restoration of the walls of Tyre, Acre, and Berytus, which had been shaken by an earthquake; and to the maintenance of poor knights in the Holy Land. The death of Fulk is attributed by one writer to grief at the mal-appropriation of a large sum deposited in another quarter.<sup>m</sup> Nor was Fulk's example without followers. Preachers of the Cross rose up in every part of England and France; the most effective of whom was the Abbot Martin, the head of a Cistercian convent, that of Paris, in Alsace, who himself bore a distinguished part in the Crusade which never reached the Holy Land.

The admonitions and exhortations of the Pope, the preachings of Fulk of Neuilly, of the Abbot Martin, and their followers, had at length stirred some of the

<sup>k</sup> “Ipse (Fulco) ex fidelium eleemosynis maximam cœpit congregare pecuniam quam pauperibus crucesignatis, tam militibus quam aliis proposuerat erogare. Licet autem causâ cupiditatis vel aliquâ sinistrâ intentione collectas istas non ficeret, occulto Dei judicio, ex tunc ejus auctoritas et prædicatio cœpit valde diminui apud homines, et, crescente pecuniâ, timor et

reverentia decrescebat.” — Jac. Viteriac. “Tandem (Fulco) sub obtentu Terræ Sanctæ, prædicationi quæstuosæ insistens, quod nimiam pecuniam aggrevavit, quasi ad succursam terræ Hierosolymitanæ, et quod erat ultra modum iracundus.” — Anonym. Chron. of Laon, in Bouquet, viii. p. 711.

<sup>m</sup> Hugo Plagon, cited by Wilken, v. p. 105.

young hearts among the secondary Princes of France. At a tournament at Cery in Champagne, Thiebault the Count of Champagne and Brie, at the age of twenty-one, and Louis Count of Blois and Chartres, at the age of twenty-seven, in an access of religious valour, assumed the Cross. The bishops and the nobles of the land caught the contagious enthusiasm: at Cery, Rainald de Montmirail and Simon de Montfort, Garnier Bishop of Troyes, Walther of Brienne, and the Marshal of Champagne Geoffroy of Villehardouin; the great names of Dampierre, of de Castel and Rochfort were enrolled in the territory of Blois; in the royal domains, the Bishop of Soissons, two Montmorencies, a de Courcy, a Malvoisin, and a Dreux.

The following year (1200) Baldwin Count of Flanders, with his wife Maria, sister of Count Thiebault of Champagne, his nephew Diedrich, Jacob of Avenes, William and Conon of Bethune, Hugh of St. Pol, and his brother Peter of Anvers, the Count of Perche and his brother, swore the solemn oath for the deliverance of the holy sepulchre. The Crusade was determined, but it was now become matter of deep deliberation as to the safest and most advantageous way of reaching the shores of Palestine. The perils and difficulties of the land journey, the treachery of the Greeks, the long march through Asia Minor, had been too often and too fatally tried: but how was this gallant band of Frenchmen to provide means for maritime transport?

Religion by her invasion of the East had raised a rival, which began as ancillary, and gradually grew up to be the mistress of the human mind—commercial enterprise. Venice was rising towards the zenith of her greatness, if with some of the danger and the glory of the Crusades, with a far larger share of the

wealth, the arts, the splendour of the East. The sagacious mind of Innocent might seem to have foreseen the growing peril to the purely religious character of the Crusades; but he miscalculated his power in supposing that a papal edict could arrest the awakened passion for the commodities of the East, and the riches which accrued to those who were their chief factors and distributors to Europe. There was already a canon of the Lateran Council under Alexander III. prohibiting, under pain of excommunication, all trade with the Saracens in instruments of war, arms, iron, or timber for galleys. Innocent determined to prohibit all commerce whatever with the Mohammedans during the war in the East. The republic, according to her usual prudence, sought not by force and open resistance what she might better gain by policy; she sent two of her noble citizens, Andrea Donato and Benedetto Grillon, to Rome to represent with due humility, that the republic of Venice, having no agriculture, depended entirely on her commerce; and that such restriction would be her ruin. Innocent brought back the edict to its former limits. He positively prohibited the supply of iron, tow, pitch, sharp stakes, cables, arms, galleys, ships, and ship-timber, either hewn or unhewn. He left the rest of their dealings with the kingdom of Egypt and of Babylon till further orders entirely free, expressing his hope that the republic would show her gratitude by assisting to the utmost the Christians in the East.<sup>n</sup>

Venice alone could furnish a fleet to transport a powerful army. After long debate the three Counts of Flanders, of Champagne, and of Blois, agreed to despatch each two ambassadors to Venice to frame a treaty for the conveyance of their forces. The ambas-

---

<sup>n</sup> Epist. i. 539.

sadors of the Count of Flanders were Conon de Bethune and Alard Maquerau ; those of the Count of Blois, John of Friaise and Walter of Gandonville ; those of the Count of Champagne, Miles of Brabant and Geoffroy of Ville-hardouin, the historian of the Crusade.<sup>o</sup> The envoys arrived in Venice in the first week of Lent ; they were received with great courtesy by the Doge,<sup>A.D. 1201.</sup> the aged Henry Dandolo ; they were lodged in a splendid palace, as became the messengers of such great princes ; after four days they were summoned to a public audience before the Doge and his Council. "Sire," they said, "we are come in the name of the great barons of France, who have taken the cross, to avenge the insults against our Lord Jesus Christ, and by God's will to conquer Jerusalem. As no power on earth can aid us as you can, they implore you, in God's name, to have compassion on the Holy Land, to avenge with them the contumely on Jesus Christ, by furnishing them with ships and other conveniences to pass the sea." "On what terms?" inquired the Doge. "On any terms you may please to name, provided we can bear them." "It is a grave matter," answered the Doge ; "and an enterprise of vast moment. In eight days ye shall have your answer." At the end of eight days the Doge made known the terms of the republic. They would furnish palanders and flat vessels to transport 4500 horses and 9000 squires, and ships for 4500 knights and 20,000 infantry, and provision the fleet for nine months. They were to receive four marks of silver for each horse, for each man two ; the total 85,000 marks.<sup>p</sup> They promised

Villehardouin, i. 11.

<sup>p</sup> "Représentant environ quatre millions et demi de la monnaie actuelle."—Daru, i. 267. "Le septier

de bled valait de cinq à six sols, le marc d'argent cinquante et quelques sols."—Sismordi reckons 4½ millions.

to man 50 galleys of their own to join the expedition.

<sup>Treaty with Villehardouin.</sup> The bargain was ratified in a great public assembly of ten thousand of the Venetian citizens before the church of St. Mark. The ambassadors threw themselves on the pavement and wept. The grave威尼斯人 expressed their emotions by loud acclamations. Mass was celebrated with great solemnity ; the next day the agreements were reduced to writing, and signed by the covenanting parties. The ambassadors returned. At Piacenza they separated, four to visit Pisa and Genoa and implore further aid ; they were coldly received by those jealous republics. Villehardouin and Maquerau returned to France. Villehardouin found his young master the Count of Champagne at Troyes, dangerously ill ; the youth, in his joy at beholding his faithful servant, mounted his horse for the last time ; he died in a few days. Thiebault was to have been at the head of the Crusade. The command was offered to the Duke of Burgundy, to the Count of Bar le Duc ; the proudest nobles declined the honour ; it was accepted by the Marquis Boniface of Montferrat. The armament suffered another heavy loss by the death of the Count of Perche.

Between Easter and Whitsuntide in the following year (1202) the Crusaders were in movement in all parts. But Venice was thought by some to have driven a hard bargain ; among others there was some mistrust of the republic. Innocent had given but a reluctant assent to the treaty of Villehardouin. Baldwin himself and his brother kept their engagement with Venice. The Count of Flanders manned his own fleet, himself embarked his best troops, which set sail for Palestine round by the Straits of Gibraltar. Some went to Marseilles. Multitudes passed onwards on the chance of easier freight to the south of Italy. The French and

Burgundians arrived but slowly, and in small divisions, at Venice; they were lodged apart in the island of St. Nicolas; among these was Baldwin of Flanders. The Count of Blois was at Pavia, on his way to the south of Italy, where he was stopped by Villehardouin, and persuaded to march to Venice. The Republic kept her word with commercial punctuality; never had been beheld a nobler fleet; her ships were in the highest order, amply sufficient for the whole force which they had stipulated to convey. They demanded the full amount of the covenanted payment, the 85,000 marks, and declared themselves ready at once to set sail. The Crusaders were in the utmost embarrassment; they bitterly complained of those who had deserted them to embark at other ports.<sup>a</sup> There were multitudes of poor knights who could not pay; others who had paid, sullenly demanded, in hopes of breaking up the expedition, that they should at once be embarked and conveyed to their place of destination. The Count of Flanders, the Count Louis of Blois, the Count of St. Pol, and the Marquis of Montferrat, contributed all their splendid plate, and stretched their credit to the utmost; there were yet 34,000 marks wanting to make up the inexorable demand.

The wise old Doge saw his advantage; his religion was the greatness of his country. It is impossible not to remember in the course of events, by which the Crusade for the recovery of the Holy Land<sup>r</sup> became a crusade for the conquest of the Eastern

<sup>a</sup> "Ha ! cum grant domages fu quant li autre qui allèrent as autres pors, ne vindrent illuec." — Villehardouin, c. 29.

\* There is a curious and full ac-

count of this Crusade and the taking of Constantinople in the *Annales Heribolenses*, apud Furtz, H. G. S. xvi. pp. 12 et seqq.

Empire, that Henry Dandolo had been, if not entirely, nearly blinded by the cruelty of the Byzantine court. His sagacity could scarcely foresee the fortuitous circumstances which led at length to that unexpected victory of the West over the East, but he had the quick-sightedness of ambition and revenge to profit by those circumstances as they arose. He proposed to his fellow citizens, with their full approval he explained to the Crusaders, that Venice would fulfil her part of the treaty, if in discharge of the 34,000 marks of silver they would lend their aid in the conquest of Zara,<sup>3</sup> which had been wrested from them unjustly, as they said, by the King of Hungary. The gallant chivalry of France stood aghast; that knights sworn to war for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre should employ their arms against a Christian city, the city of a Christian King under the special protection of the Pope! that the free armies of the cross should be the hirelings of the Venetian republic! But the year was wearing away; the hard necessity bowed them to submission. The Doge pursued his plan with consummate address. As though he too shared in the religious enthusiasm which was to

be gratified in all its fulness after the capture

<sup>Sept. 2.</sup> of Zara, on the great festival of the Nativity of the Virgin, Dandolo ascended the pulpit in the church of St. Mark. In a powerful speech he extolled the religious zeal of the pilgrims: "Old and feeble as I am, what can I do better than join these noble cavaliers in their holy enterprise? Let my son Rainier take the rule in Venice; I will live or die with the pilgrims of the Cross." But there was a careful stipulation behind, that Venice was to share equally in all the conquests of

the Crusaders. The Doge advanced to the altar, and fixed the cross in his high cotton cap ; the people and the pilgrims melted into tears.

No sooner was this over than a new and unexpected event excited the utmost amazement among the French pilgrims : the appearance of messengers from the young Prince Alexius Comnenus, entreating the aid of the Crusaders to replace his father on his rightful throne of Constantinople. After the overthrow of the first noble line of Comnenus, the history of Byzantium had for some years been one bloody revolution ; a short reign ended in blinding or death was the fate of each successive Emperor. Isaac Angelus, hurried from the sanctuary in which he had taken refuge to be placed on the throne, had <sup>A.D. 1185</sup> <sub>to 1195.</sub> reigned for nearly ten years, when he was supplanted by the subtle treason of his brother Alexius. Isaac was blinded, his young son Alexius imprisoned. But mercy is a proscribed indulgence to an usurper ; a throne obtained by cruelty can only be maintained by cruelty. Alexius abandoned himself to pleasure ; in his Mohammedan harem he neglected the affairs of state, he increased the burthens of the people, he even relaxed his jealousy of his brother and nephew. The blind Isaac, in a pleasant villa on the Bosphorus, could communicate with his old partisans and the discontented of all classes. The son was allowed such freedom as enabled him to make his escape in a Pisan vessel, under the disguise of a sailor, and to reach Ancona. From Ancona he hastened to Rome ; the son of a blinded father, to seek sympathy ; a prince expelled from his throne by an usurper, to seek justice ; an exile, to seek generous compassion from the Vicar of Christ. He was coldly received. Innocent had already been tempted by

Arrival of  
Alexius  
Comnenus  
in Venice.

some advances—religious advances—on the part of the usurper: he would not risk the chance of subjugating the Eastern Church to the See of Rome through the means of the sovereign in actual possession. The sister of young Alexius was the wife of Philip of Swabia; perhaps this alliance with his enemy operated on the policy of Innocent. Alexius proceeded to the court of Philip; he was received with generous courtesy; at Verona he was introduced to a great body of Crusaders, and implored their aid in the name of Philip. His messengers were now in Venice appealing to the chivalry, to the justice, the humanity, the compassion of the gallant knights of France, and the lofty senators of the republic. Did this new opening for the extension of the power and influence of Venice, or for revenge against the perfidious Greeks of Constantinople, expand at once before Dandolo into anticipations of that close which made this crusade the most eventful, the most important to Christendom, to civilisation, even perhaps beyond the first conquest of Jerusalem and the establishment of the Christian kingdom in the Holy Land? The Doge and the Pilgrims listened with undisguised sympathy to the appeal of young Alexius; but as yet with nothing beyond earnest expressions of interest in his cause. Both parties were fully occupied, one in urging, the other in sullenly preparing themselves for the expedition against Zara. A large body of Germans had now arrived, under Conrad Bishop of Halberstadt, Count Berthold of Katzenellenbogen, and other chiefs. The Abbot Martin had crossed the Tyrolese Alps with a vast band of followers of the lower orders. Martin himself lived with the austerity of a monk in the camp: all the splendid offerings lavished upon him by the way were spent on his soldiery. In each of two days it is said he expended

a hundred marks of silver, seventy on the third. He was entertained for eight days in the palace of the Bishop of Verona, and at length arrived with all his host at Venice. The indignation of the Germans, and of the followers of Abbot Martin, was vehement when they were told of the meditated attack on Zara. They had heard that Egypt was wasted with famine, from the failure of the inundation of the Nile; that the Paynims of Syria were in profound distress from earthquakes and bad harvests; they remonstrated against this invasion of the lands of their ally the King of Hungary, who had himself taken up the Cross. The Venetians held the Crusaders to their bond: Zara or the rest of the marks of silver was their inflexible demand. The Germans, as the French, were compelled to yield. The Pope himself had no influence on the grasping ambition of the republic.

And this was Pope Innocent's Crusade, the Crusade to which he looked as the great act of his Pontificate! Now when it was assembled in its promising, overpowering strength, it had been seized and diverted to the aggrandisement of Venice. He sent his Legate Peter of Capua, with the strongest remonstrances, to interdict even the Venetians from the war against Christian Zara, and to lead the other Pilgrims directly to the Holy Land. The Venetians almost contemptuously informed the Cardinal that he might embark on board their fleet as the preacher and spiritual director of the Crusaders, but on no account must he presume to exercise his legatine power; if he refused these terms he might return from whence he came. The Abbot Martin entreated the Cardinal to release him from his vow; as he could not at once proceed against the Saracens, he would retire to his peaceful cloister

The Cardinal Peter implored him to remain, if possible, with the other ecclesiastics, to prevent the shedding of Christian blood. For himself he shook the dust from his feet, and left the contumacious city. Letters from Innocent, menaces of excommunication were treated with as slight respect; only some few of the French, some of the Germans, withdrew; the Marquis Boniface of Montferrat alleged important affairs, and declined as yet to take the command of the Crusade.

Never did Crusade set forth under more imposing Oct. 8, 1202. auspices. No doubt the martial spirit of all Crusade sets forth. ranks could not resist the spreading enthusiasm, when four hundred and eighty noble ships, admirably appointed, with banners and towers, blazing with the arms and shields of the chivalry of Europe, expanded their full sails to the autumnal wind, and moved in stately order down the Adriatic. It seemed as if they might conquer the whole world.<sup>t</sup> On the eve of St. Martin's day they were off Zara; the haven was forced; they were under the walls of the city; they landed; the knights disembarked their horses. The sight of this majestic fleet appalled the inhabitants of Zara; they sent a deputation to surrender the city on the best terms they could obtain. The Doge, with mis-timed courtesy, replied, "that he must consult the counts and barons of the army." The Counts and Barons assembled round the Doge advised the acceptance of the capitulation. But without the tent where they sate was Simon de Montfort, with others whose object it was to break up the misguided army.<sup>u</sup>

"Et bien semblait estone qui  
terre deust conquerre."—Villehardouin; perhaps  
he foresaw the yet undeveloped cha-  
racter of De Montfort.

De Montfort taunted the Zarans with their dastardly surrender of so strong a city :—“ We are Christians, we war not against our brother Christians.” Simon de Montfort then retired, and from that time stood aloof from the siege. When the Doge demanded the presence of the ambassadors that they might ratify the treaty, they had disappeared; the city walls were manned for obstinate defence. At the same time rose Guido the Abbot of Vaux Cernay :—“ In the name of the Pope I prohibit the assault on his Christian cities: ye are Pilgrims, and have taken the Cross for other ends.” The Doge was furious; he reproached the Crusaders with having wrested from him a city already in his power; he summoned them to fulfil the treaty to which they had sworn. The greater part either could not or would not resist the appeal. The siege began again, and lasted for five days. On the sixth Zara opened her gates. The Doge took possession of the city in the name of his republic: but divided the rich spoil equally with the Crusaders.

Zara was taken, but that was not enough; the presence of the crusading army was necessary to maintain the city against any sudden attack of the King of Hungary, and to strengthen and secure the Dalmatian possessions of Venice. The Doge represented to the Barons that the bad season was now drawing on: Zara offered safe and pleasant winter quarters, with abundance of provisions. Throughout Greece and the East there was scarcity: \* they could obtain no supplies in the course of their voyage. The Barons yielded, as they could not but yield, to those arguments. The city was divided: the Venetians occupied the part nearest the

port and their ships ; the French the rest. But among the pilgrims there were many who felt bitterly that <sup>Winter quarters.</sup> they were only slaves in the hands of the Venetians ; their religious feelings revolted against the occupation of the Christian city ; they called it “the city of transgression.” Three nights after broke out a fierce and sanguinary quarrel between the Franks and Venetians, which was with great difficulty allayed by the more sage and influential of each host. Fourteen days after this arrived the Marquis of Montferrat, the Commander-in-Chief of the Crusade : though he and many of the French knights had designedly remained in Italy till the conquest of Zara ; now that this conquest was achieved they joined the army of the pilgrims.

<sup>Ambassadors from King Philip.</sup> Two weeks later came those who had accompanied Alexius to the court of Philip of Swabia, with ambassadors from King Philip. They appeared before an assembly held in the palace occupied by the Doge of Venice. “We are here on the part of King Philip and the Prince of Constantinople his brother-in-law, before the Doge of Venice and the Barons of this host. King Philip will entrust his brother-in-law in the hand of God, and in yours. You are armed for God, for the right, for justice ; it becomes you, therefore, to restore the disinherited to his rightful throne. Nor will it be less to your advantage than to your honour ; for your advantage in your great design, the conquest of the Holy Land. As soon as you restore Alexius to his throne, he will first submit the Empire of the Romans to obedience to Rome, from which it has been separated so long. In the next place, as he knows that you are exhausted by the vast cost of this armament, he will give you two hundred thousand marks of silver, and supply the whole army with provisions. He

will either join the armament against Egypt in person, or send ten thousand men, to be maintained for a year at his charge. During his lifetime he will maintain five hundred knights for the defence of the Holy Land."

No sooner had the Barons met the next day to discuss this high matter, than Guido, the Cistercian Abbot of Vaux Cernay, rose and declared emphatically that they came not to wage war on Christians; to Syria they would go, and only to Syria. He was supported by the faction desirous of dissolving the armament. It was replied that they could now do nothing in Syria; that the only way to subjugate permanently the Holy Land was by Egypt or by Greece. Even the clergy were divided: the Cistercian Abbot of Loces, a man of high esteem for his profound piety, took the other side. Words ran high even among those holy persons.

The treaty was accepted (they could not without shame refuse it) by the Marquis of Montferrat, Treaty with Alexius. the Count of Flanders, Hennegau, the Count of Blois, and the Count of St. Pol; yet only eight knights more dared to set their hands to this doubtful covenant. But all the winter there were constant defections in the army; some set out by land, and were massacred by the barbarous Sclavonians; some embarked for Syria in merchant vessels; at a later period Simon de Montfort quitted the camp with many noble followers, and joined the King of Hungary. "If God," says Villehardouin, "had not loved the army, it would have melted away through the contending factions." It was the Papal ban, either actually in force, or impending in all its awful menace over the pilgrim army, which was alleged as the summons to all holy men to abandon the unhallowed expedition. The bishops in the army had taken upon themselves to suspend this

anathema. The Barons determined to send a mission to Rome to deprecate the wrath of the Pope. The Bishop of Soissons, John of Noyon the Chancellor of the Count of Flanders, ecclesiastics of fame for learning and holiness, with the knights John of Friaise and Robert de Boves, were, not without mistrust, sworn solemnly on the most holy reliques, to return to the army. The oath was broken by Robert of Boves, whom the army held as a perjured knight. Their mission was to explain to the Pope that they had been compelled, through the treacherous abandonment of the enterprise by those crusaders who had embarked in other ports, to obey the bidding of Venice, and to lend themselves to the siege of Zara. Innocent admitted their plea—it was his only course. He gave permission to the Bishop of Soissons and John of Noyon provisionally to suspend the interdict till the arrival of his legate, Peter of Capua; but the Barons were bound under a solemn pledge to give full satisfaction to the Pope for their crime. Yet notwithstanding the bold remonstrance of John of Noyon (Innocent commanded him to be silent), they were compelled to bear a brief letter of excommunication against the Venetians. Boniface had the prudence to prevent the immediate publication of that ban. He sent to Rome their act of submission, couched in the terms dictated by the Cardinal Peter; and intimated that the Venetians were about to send their own messengers to entreat the forgiveness of the Pope for the conquest of Zara. But the Venetians made no sign of submission. Positive orders were given to deliver the brief of excommunication into the hands of the Doge. If the Doge received it, he received it with utter indifference; and two singular letters of Innocent prescribe the course to be followed by the absolved Crusaders, thus

of necessity, on board the fleet of Venice, in perpetual intercourse with the profane and excommunicated Venetians. They might communicate with them as far as necessity compelled so long as they were on board their ships; no sooner had they reached the Holy Land, than they were to sever the ungodly alliance; they were on no account to go forth to war with them against the Saracens, lest they should incur the shameful disaster of those in the Old Testament, who went up in company with Achan and other sinners against the Philistines.<sup>v</sup>

The mission of the Crusaders had been entirely silent as to the new engagement to place the young Alexius on the throne of Constantinople. Innocent either knew not or would not know this new delinquency. He received the first authentic intelligence from the legate Peter of Capua. The Pope's letters denounced the whole design in the most lofty admonitory terms. "However guilty the Emperor of Constantinople and his subjects of blinding his brother and of usurping the throne, it is not for you to invade the Empire, which is under the especial protection of the Holy See. Ye took not the cross to avenge the wrongs of the Prince Alexius; ye are under the solemn obligation to avenge the Crucified, to whose service ye are sworn." He intimated that he had written to the Emperor of Constantinople to supply them with provisions; the Emperor had faithfully promised to do so. Only in the case that supplies were refused them, then, as soldiers of Him to whom the earth and all its produce belonged, they might take them by force; but still in the fear of God, faithfully

Innocent  
condemns the  
expedition to  
Constanti-  
nople.

paying or promising to pay for the same, and without injury to person.

But already the fleet was in full sail for Corfu, the <sup>Fleet off  
Constanti-  
nople.</sup> Prince Alexius on board. Of the excommunication against the Venetians no one took the slightest heed, least of all the Venetians themselves. Simon de Montfort alone, who had stood aloof from the siege of Zara, on the day of embarkation finally separated himself from the camp of the ungodly, who refused obedience to the Pope. With his brother and some few French knights he passed over to the king of Hungary, and after many difficulties reached the Holy Land. In truth, the Crusaders had no great faith in the sincerity of the Pope's condemnation of the enterprise against Constantinople. The subjugation of the heretical, if not rival, Church of Byzantium to the Church of St. Peter, had been too long the great aim of Papal ambition, for them to suppose that even by more violent or less justifiable means than the replacing the legitimate Emperor on the throne and the degradation of an usurper, it would not soon reconcile itself to the Papal sense of right and justice. Some decent regard to his acknowledgment of, to his amicable intercourse with the usurper, might be becoming; yet even as a step to the conquest of the Holy Land, it might well be considered the most prudent policy. In a short time the submission of the Greek Church, the departure of the Crusaders under better auspices to the Holy Land (for as yet even the ambitious Venetians could hardly apprehend the absolute conquest of Constantinople, and the establishment of a Latin Empire), would allay the seeming resentment of Innocent. In the mean time, no doubt many hearts were kindled with the romance of this new adventure and the desire to behold this second

Rome; vague expectations were entertained of rich plunder, or at least of splendid reward for their services by the grateful Alexius; it is even said that many were full of strange hopes of more precious spoils, the pillage of the precious reliques which were accumulated in the churches of Constantinople, and of which the heretical Greeks ought to be righteously robbed for the benefit of the more orthodox believers of the West.

The taking of Constantinople and the foundation of the Latin Empire concern Christian history in <sup>Taking of Constantinople.</sup> their results more than in their actual achievements. The arrival of the fleet before Constantinople; the ill-organised defence and pusillanimous flight of the usurper Alexius; the restoration of the blind Isaac Angelus and his son; the discontent of the Greeks at the subservience of young Alexius to the Latins; his dethronement, and the elevation of Alexius Ducas (Mourzoufle) to the throne; the siege; the murder of the young Alexius; the flight of Mourzoufle, and the storming of the city by the Crusaders, were crowded into less than one eventful year.<sup>2</sup> A Count of Flanders sat on the throne of the Eastern Cæsars.

Europe, it might have been expected, by the Latin conquest of Constantinople and of great part <sup>Partition of the conquest.</sup> of the Byzantine Empire, would have become one great Christian league or political system; European Christendom one Church, under the acknowledged supremacy of the Pope. But the Latin Empire was not that of a Western sovereign ascending the Byzantine throne, and ruling over the Greek population undisturbed in their possessions, and according to the

---

\* The fleet reached Constantinople the eve of St. John the Baptist, June 23, 1203. The storm took place April 13, 1204.

laws of Justinian and the later Emperors of the East. His followers did not gradually mingle by intermarriages with the Greeks, and so infuse, as in other parts of Europe, new strength and energy into that unwarlike and effete race. The Emperor was a sovereign elected by the Venetians and the Franks, governing entirely by the right of conquest. It was a foreign settlement, a foreign lord, a foreign feudal system, which never mingled in the least with the Greeks. The Latins kept entirely to themselves all honours, all dignities (no Greek was admitted to office), even all the lands; the whole country, as it was conquered, was portioned out as Constantinople had been, into great fiefs between the Venetians and Franks. This western feudal system so established throughout the land implied the absolute, the supreme ownership of the soil by the conquerors. The condition of the Greeks under the new rule depended on the character of their new masters. In Constantinople the high-born and the wealthy had gladly accepted the permission to escape with their lives; the Crusaders had taken possession of such at least of their gorgeous palaces and splendid establishments as had escaped the three fires which during the successive sieges had destroyed so large a part of the city.\* When the Marquis of Montferrat took possession of Thessalonica he turned the inhabitants out of all the best houses, and bestowed them on his followers: in other places they were oppressed with a kind of indifferent lenity. But they were, in truth, held as a race of serfs, over whom the Latins exercised lordship by the right

\* In the conflagration on the night of the capture, caused by some Flemings, who thought by setting fire to the houses to keep off the attack of the Greeks, as many houses were destroyed, according to Vile-hardouin, as would be found in three of the largest cities in France.

of conquest; they were left, indeed, to be governed, as had been the case with the subject Roman population in all the German conquests, by their own laws and their own magistrates. The constitution of the Latin Empire was the same with that of the kingdom of Jerusalem, founded in the midst of a population chiefly Mohammedan; their code of law was the Assises of Jerusalem. No Greek was admitted to any post of honour or dignity till after the defeat and capture of the Emperor Baldwin. Then his successor, the Emperor Henry, found it expedient to make some advances towards conciliation; he endeavoured to propitiate by honourable appointments some of the leading Greeks. But to this he was compelled by necessity. The original Crusaders gradually died off, or were occupied in maintaining their own conquests in Hellas or in the Morea; only few adventurers, notwithstanding the temptations and promises held out by the Latin Emperors, arrived from the West. The Emperor in Constantinople became a sovereign of Greeks. It is surprising that the Latin Empire endured for half a century: had there been any Greeks of resolution or enterprise, Constantinople at least might have been much sooner wrested from their hands.

The establishment of Latin Christianity in the East was no less a foreign conquest. It was not the conversion of the Greek Church to the creed, the usages, the ritual, the Papal supremacy of the West; it was the foundation, the super-induction of a new Church, alien in language, in rites, in its clergy, which violently dispossessed the Greeks of their churches and monasteries, and appropriated them to its own uses. It was part of the original compact between the Venetians and the Franks, before the final attack on the city, that the churches of Constantinople should be

Establish-  
ment of Latin  
Christianity.

equally divided between the two nations : the ecclesiastical property throughout the realm was to be divided, after providing for the maintenance of public worship according to the Latin form by a Latin clergy, exactly on the same terms as the rest of the conquered territory. The French prelates might, indeed, claim equal rights, as having displayed at least equal valour and confronted the same dangers with the boldest of the barons. The vessels that bore the bishops of Soissons and Troyes, the Paradise and the Pilgrim, were the first which grappled with the Towers of Constantinople : from them were thrown the scaling ladders on which the conquerors mounted to the storm ; the episcopal banners were the first that floated in triumph on the battlements of Constantinople.<sup>b</sup>

Like the Emperor Alexius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, John Camaterus, had fled, but it was at a time and under circumstances far less ignominious. The clergy had not been less active in the defence of the city, than the Frankish bishops in the assault. After the flight of Mourzoufle they had chiefly influenced the choice of Theodore Lascaris as Emperor ; the Patriarch had presented him to the people, and with him vainly endeavoured to rouse their panic-stricken courage. It was not till the city was in the hands of the enemy that the Patriarch abandoned his post. He was met in that disastrous plight described by Nicetas, riding on an ass, reduced to the primitive Apostolic poverty, without scrip, without purse, without staff, without shoes. It was time, indeed, to fly from horrors and unhallowed crimes which he could not avert. The Crusaders had advanced to the siege of Constantinople in the name of

---

• See the despatch to Pope Innocent announcing the taking of Constantinople.

Christ; they had issued strong orders to respect the churches, the monasteries, the persons of the clergy, the chastity of the nuns. The three Latin bishops had published a terrible excommunication against all who should commit such sacrilegious acts of violence. But of what effect were orders, what awe had excommunications for a fierce soldiery, flushed with unexpected victory, let loose on the wealthiest, most luxurious, most dissolute capital of the world, among a people of a different language, whom they had been taught to despise as the most perfidious of mankind, the base enemies of all the former armies of the Cross, tainted with obstinate heresy? Nicetas, himself an eye-witness and sufferer in these terrible scenes, may be suspected of exaggeration, when he contrasts the discipline and self-denial of the Mohammedans, who under Saladin stormed Jerusalem, with the rapacity, the lust, the cruelty of the Christian conquerors of Constantinople. But the reports which had reached Pope Innocent would hardly darken the truth. "How," he writes, "shall the Greek Church return to ecclesiastical unity and to respect for the Apostolic See, when they have beheld in the Latins only examples of wickedness and works of darkness, for which they might well abhor them worse than dogs? Those who were believed to seek not their own but the things of Christ Jesus, steeping those swords, which they ought to have wielded against the Pagans, in Christian blood, spared neither religion, nor age, nor sex; they were practising fornications, incests, adulteries, in the sight of men; abandoning matrons and virgins dedicated to God to the lewdness of grooms."

---

\* Innocent. Epist. viii. 126 (apud Brequigny and Du Theil). Compare the whole detailed account in Wilken, v. p. 301, *et seq.*

Nor were they satisfied with seizing the wealth of the Emperors, the spoils of the princes and the people; they lifted their hands to the treasures of the churches; what is more heinous! the very consecrated vessels; tearing the tablets of silver from the very altars, breaking in pieces the most sacred things, carrying off crosses and reliques." Some revolting incidents of this plunder may be gathered from the Historians. Many rushed at once to the churches and monasteries. In the Church of Santa Sophia the silver was rent off from the magnificent pulpit: the table of oblation, admired for its precious material and exquisite workmanship, broken to pieces. Mules and horses were led into the churches to carry off the ponderous vessels; if they slipped down on the smooth marble floor, they were forced to rise up by lash and spur, so that their blood flowed on the pavement. A prostitute mounted the Patriarch's throne, and screamed out a disgusting song, accompanied with the most offensive gestures. Instead of the holy chants the aisles rung with wild shouts of revelry or indecent oaths and imprecations. The very sacred vessels were not spared; they were turned into drinking cups. The images were robbed of their gold frames and precious stones. It is said that the body and blood of the Lord were profanely cast down upon the floor, and trodden under foot.<sup>d</sup>

There was one kind of plunder which had irresistible attraction for the most pious, that of reliques. These, like the rest of the spoil, were to have been brought into the common stock, to be divided according to the stipu-

<sup>d</sup> Wilken conjectures that the expression of Nicetas may refer to a casket, which was supposed to contain some of the actual body and blood imparted by the Lord to his disciples before his crucifixion.—See Wilken, p. 305.

lated rule. But even the Abbot Martin<sup>e</sup> was guilty of this holy robbery. His monastery of Paris in Alsace, as well as the churches of the bishops present at the siege, those of Soissons and Halberstadt, boasted of many sacred treasures from Constantinople, which might have been fairly obtained, but which were supposed to have been more than the just share of those warlike dignitaries.<sup>f</sup>

No sooner was order restored than the Franks and Venetians took possession of the churches as their own ; the principal clergy had fled, the inferior seem to have been dismissed or were driven out as if they had been Mohammedan Imauns : of provision for the worship of the Greeks according to their own ritual, in their own language, nothing is heard. After the election of the Emperor the first act was the election of a <sup>Election of</sup> Emperor Patriarch. It was an article of the primary compact, that of whichever nation, Venetian or Frank, the Emperor should be chosen, the nomination of the Patriarch should be with the other. In the election of the Emperor it was a significant circumstance, that of the twelve electors, those of the Franks were all ecclesiastics—the Bishops of Troyes, Soissons, Halberstadt, Bethlehem, and Ptolemaïs, with the Abbot of Loces. Those of Venice were lay nobles. The Bishops of Sois-

<sup>e</sup> “Indignum ducens sacrilegium, nisi in re sacra, committere.”—Günther, who gives a full account of this holy theft of the Abbot Martin. His spoil was a stain (*vestigium*) of the blood of the Lord, a piece of the Holy Cross, the arm of the apostle James, no small portion of the bones of John the Baptist, some of the milk of the Blessed Virgin, and many more.—Wilken, Günther. See, too, the theft of the head of S. Clement, Pope and

martyr, by Dalmatius of Sergy from the Biblioth. Cluniac, also in Wilken. The note in Wilken, v. p. 306, is full of curious details.

<sup>f</sup> Some ventured to doubt the virtue of these acts. The Abbot Urspergensis says of Martin’s plunder: “An furtivæ sint, judicet, qui legit. An videlicet Dominus Papa talem rapinam in populo Christiano factam potuerit justificare, sicut furtum Israelitici populi in Egypto justificatur auctoritate divinit.”—p. 256.

sons and of Troyes would have placed the blind old Doge Dandolo on the imperial throne: his election was opposed by the Venetians. Pantoleon Barbo alleged the ostensible objection, the jealousy which would spring up among the Franks. But probably the wise patriotism of Dandolo himself, and his knowledge of the Venetian mind, would make him acquiesce in the loss of an honour so dangerous to his country. A Doge of Venice exalted into an Emperor, taking up his residence in the Palace of Constantinople instead of amid their own lagunes, would have been the lord, not the accountable magistrate, of the republic. Venice might have sunk to an outpost, as it were, of the Eastern Empire. But Venice, though consenting to the loss of the Empire, made haste to secure the Patriarchate.<sup>s</sup> The Venetians immediately

<sup>Election of Patriarch.</sup> appointed certain of their own ecclesiastics Canons of Santa Sophia, in order to give canonical form to the election. By a secret oath<sup>h</sup> these canons were sworn never to elect into their chapter any one but a Venetian.<sup>i</sup> With their wonted sagacity, their first choice fell on Thomas Morosini, of one of their noble families, as yet only in sub-deacon's orders, but of a lofty and unblemished character, who had been some time at Rome, and was known to stand high in the estimation of the Pope. The Venetians, who, when they had any great object of ambition at stake, treated with utter contempt the Papal interdict, yet never wan-

<sup>s</sup> Pope Innocent boldly asserts that the Church of Constantinople was raised into a Patriarchate by the See of Rome. Was this ignorance or mendacity?

<sup>h</sup> Wilken has cited this oath from the Liber Albus, in the archives of Vienna.—vol. v. p. 330.

<sup>i</sup> The Patriarch was absolved from his oath that he would appoint only Venetian canons into the chapter of S. Sophia. The Church was to receive a fifteenth of all property, with some exceptions, gained by the conquest of Constantinople. Tithes were to be paid.

tonly provoked that dangerous power; now, as always when it suited their schemes, were among the humblest and most devout subjects of the Holy See. Nor was Innocent disinclined to receive the submission of the lords of one-half of the Eastern Empire.

The Pope had watched with intense anxiety the progress of the Crusade towards Constantinople. He had kept his faith with the usurper, who had promised to unite the Greek Church to the See of Rome; he had asserted the exclusive religious object of the Crusades, by protesting first against the siege of Zara, and then against the diversion to Constantinople: the Venetians, at least, were still under the unrevoked excommunication. But the ignominious flight of his ally, the Emperor Alexius, had released him from that embarrassing connexion. No sooner was the young Alexius on the throne, than the Pope reminded him of the protestations of submission which he had made, when a suppliant for aid at the court of Rome, and which he had renewed when on board the Pilgrim fleet. He urged the Crusaders to enforce this acknowledgment of the Papal supremacy. This great blessing to Christendom could alone justify the tardy fulfilment of their vows: for the reconquest of the Holy Land.

Masters of Constantinople, their victory achieved, Franks and Venetians vied in their humble addresses to the Holy Father. The Emperor Baldwin, by the hands of Barochias, the Master of the Lombard Templars, informed the Pope of his election to the Empire of Constantinople, and implored his ratification of the treaty with the Venetians,<sup>k</sup> those true and zealous allies, with-

\* The letter of Baldwin describes the Western Christians and the Unbelievers; as framing disastrous treaties with the Mohammedans, and sup-

out whose aid he could not have won, without whose support he could not maintain, the Eastern Empire, founded for the honour of God and of the Roman See. He extolled the valiant acts of the bishops in the capture of the city. He entreated the Pope to admonish Western Christendom to send new supplies of warriors for the maintenance of his Empire, and to share in the immeasurable temporal and spiritual riches, which they might so easily obtain. The Pope was urged to grant to them, as to other soldiers of the Cross, the plenary absolution from their sins. Above all, he pressed that clergy should be sent in great numbers to plant the Latin Church, not in blood, but in freedom and peace throughout the noble and pleasant land. He invited the Pope to hold a general Council at Constantinople. These prayers were accompanied with splendid presents from his share of the booty.<sup>m</sup>

The Venetians were not less solicitous now to propitiate the Holy Father. Already they had sent to the Legate, Peter of Capua, at Cyprus; they implored this prelate, whom they had treated before with such contemptuous disregard, to interpose his kind offices and to annul the excommunication.

lying them with arms, provisions, and ships; while they refused all these things to the Latins. "But (he is addressing the Pope) it is the height of their wickedness obstinately to disclaim the supremacy of Rome." "Hæc est quæ in odium apostolici culminis, Apostolorum principis nomen audire vix poterat, nec unam eidem inter Græcos ecclesiam concedebat qui omnium ecclesiarum accepit ab ipso Dominio principatum." The Latins were

greatly shocked at the Greek worship of pictures. "Hæc est quæ Christum solis didicerat honorare picturis." They sometimes, among their wicked rites, repeated baptism. They considered the Latins not as men, but as dogs, whose blood it was meritorious to shed. This is an evidence of the feelings of the Crusaders towards the Greeks.—Apud Gesta Innocent. c. xci.

<sup>m</sup> Compare Raynaldus, sub anno.

The Legate had sent the Treasurer of the church of Nicosia, with powers to receive their oath of future obedience to the Roman See and the fulfilment of their vows as soldiers of the Cross, and provisionally to suspend the interdict, which was not absolutely revocable without the sanction of the Pope. Two Venetian nobles were now despatched to Rome by the Doge. They were to inform the Pope, that, compelled by the treachery of the young Emperor Alexius, who had attempted to burn their fleet, with their brethren the temporal and spiritual pilgrims, they had conquered Constantinople for the honour of God and of the Roman Church, and in order to facilitate the conquest of the Holy Land. They endeavoured to explain away their attack on Zara; they could not believe that the inhabitants of that city were under the Pope's protection, therefore they had borne in patience the excommunication, till relieved from it by the Cardinal Peter.

Innocent replied to both the Emperor and the Doge with some reserve, but with manifest satisfaction. He had condemned, with the severity which became the Holy Father, the enormities perpetrated during the storming of the city, the worse than infidel acts of lust and cruelty, the profane plunder and violation of the churches. But it was manifestly the divine judgement, that those who had so long been forborne in mercy, and had been so often admonished not only by former Popes, but by Innocent himself, to return to the unity of the Church, and to send succours to the Holy Land, should forfeit both their place and their territory to those who were in the unity of the Church, and sworn to deliver the sepulchre of Christ: in order that the land, delivered from the bad, should be com.  
Innocent's answer.

mitted to good husbandmen, who would bring forth good fruit in due season.<sup>n</sup>

The Pontiff took the new Empire under the special protection of the Holy See. He commanded all the Sovereigns of the West, and all the prelates of the Church, archbishops, bishops, and abbots, to maintain friendly relations with the new Latin kingdom, so important for the conquest of the East. He ratified the revocation of the excommunication against the Venetians by his Legate the Cardinal Peter. He declined, indeed, to accede to the prayer of the Doge to be released from his vow, from his obligation to follow the Crusade to the Holy Land, on account of his great age and feebleness; but the refusal was the highest flattery. The Pope could not take upon himself to deprive the army of the Cross of one endowed by God with such exalted gifts, so valiant, and so wise: if the Doge would serve God and his Church henceforth with the same glorious ability with which he had served himself and the world, he could not fail of attaining the highest reward.

Innocent assumed at once the full ecclesiastical administration. There was one clause in the compact between the Franks and the Venetians, which called forth his unqualified condemnation; they had presumed to seize the property of the Church, and after assigning what they might think fit for the maintenance of the clergy, to submit the rest to the same partition as the other lands. This sacrilegious article the bishops and the abbots in the army were to strive to annul with all their spiritual authority; the Emperor and the Doge of Venice were admonished to abrogate it as injurious to

---

<sup>n</sup> This is from the letter to the Marquis of Montferrat, in the *Gesta*, c. xcii.

the honour, and as trenching on the sovereign authority of the Roman Church. Nor would Innocent admit the right of the self-elected Chapter, or worse, a Chapter appointed by lay authority, to the nomination of the Patriarch. He absolutely annulled this uncanonical proceeding; but from his high respect for Thomas Morosini, and the necessity to provide a head to the Church of Constantinople of his own authority, he invested Morosini with the vacant Patriarchate.<sup>o</sup> Morosini was allowed to accumulate within a few days the orders of Deacon, Priest, and Bishop; the Pope invested him with the Archiepiscopal pall. Innocent at the same time bestowed the highest privileges and powers on the new Patriarch, yet with studious care that all those privileges and powers emanated from, and were prescribed and limited by the Papal authority.<sup>p</sup> He might wear the pall at all times in all places, except in Rome and in the presence of the Pope; in processions in Constantinople he might ride a white horse with white housings. He had the power of absolving those who committed violence against a spiritual person; to anoint kings within his Patriarchate at the request and with the sanction of the Emperor; to ordain at the appointed seasons and appoint all qualified persons, to distribute, with the advice of sage counsellors, all the goods of the Church, without the approbation of Rome in each special case. But all these privileges were the gifts of a superior; the dispensation with appeal in certain cases, only confirmed more strongly the right of receiving appeals in all others. Of the dispossessed and

<sup>o</sup> “Elegimus et confirmavimus eum Ecclesiae Patriarcham.”—Epist. r.ii. 20.

<sup>p</sup> The patriarchate of Constantino-

ple, Innocent averred, owed its original superiority over the patriarchate of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, to a grant from the successor of St. Peter

fugitive Patriarch no notice is taken either in this or any other document; the Latin Patriarch was planting a new Church in the East as in a Pagan land.

Thus then set forth the Latin Patriarch to establish a Latin Church in the East. The Emperor had before entreated the Pope to send a supply of breviaries and missals and rituals according to the Roman use, with clergy competent to administer to the Latins. He requested also some Cistercian monks to teach the churches of Antony and Basil the true rules and constitutions of the monastic life.<sup>a</sup> Innocent appealed to the prelates of France to supply this want of clergy for the new Church of the East. To the bishops he denounced the heresies of the Greeks; first their departure from the unity of the Church, then their denial of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son as well as from the Father; their use of leavened bread in the Eucharist. “But Samaria had now returned to Jerusalem; God had transferred the Empire of the Greeks from the proud to the lowly, from the superstitious to the religious, from the schismatics to the Catholics, from the disobedient to the devoted servants of God.”<sup>r</sup> He addressed the high school of Paris to send some of their learned youth to study in the East, the source and origin of knowledge; he not only opened a wide field to their spiritual ambition, the conversion of the Greeks to the true Apostolic faith; he described the East as a rich land of gold and silver and precious stones, as overflowing with corn, wine, and oil. But neither the holy desire of saving the souls of the Greeks, nor the noble thirst for knowledge, nor the promise of these temporal advantages (which, notwithstanding the splendid spoil sent home

<sup>a</sup> Epist. viii. 70.

<sup>r</sup> Gest. xciv.

by some of the crusaders, and the precious treasures of art and of skill which were offered in their churches, they must have known not to be so plentiful, or so lightly won), had much effect; no great movement of the clergy took place towards the East. Philip Augustus made a wiser, but not much more successful attempt; he established a college of Constantinople in the University of Paris for the education of young Greeks, who, bringing with them some of the knowledge and learning of the East, might be instructed in the language, the creed, and the ritual of the West. This was the first unmarked step to the cultivation of the study of Greek in the West, which some centuries afterwards was so powerfully to assist in the overthrow of the sole dominion of Latin Christianity in Europe.

Thus, then, while Rome appointed the Patriarch of Constantinople, and all the churches within the dominion of the Latins adopted the Roman ritual, by the more profound hatred, on the one side contemptuous, on the other revengeful, of the two nations, the reconciliation of the Eastern and Western Churches was farther removed than ever. No doubt this inauspicious attempt to subjugate, rather than win, tended incalculably to the obstinate estrangement, which endured to the end. The Patriarch, John Camaterus, took refuge in the new Empire founded by Theodore Lascaris in Nicæa Greek Patriarch at Nicæa. and its neighbourhood: to him, no doubt, the clergy throughout Greece maintained their secret allegiance. Nor was the reception of the new Latin Patriarch imposing for its cordial unanimity. Before Morosini disembarked, he sent word to the shore that the clergy and the people should be prepared to meet him with honourable homage. But the Frank clergy stood aloof; they had protested against the election being left to the

Venetians; they declared that the election had been carried by unworthy subtlety; that the Pope himself had been imposed upon by the crafty republicans. Not one appeared, and the only shouts of rejoicing were those of the few Venetians. The Greeks gazed with

<sup>Reception  
of new  
Patriarch.</sup> wonder and disgust at the smooth-faced prelate, without a beard, fat as a well-fed swine; on his dress, his demeanour,<sup>s</sup> the display of his ring. And the clergy, as beardless as their bishop, eating at the same table, like to him in dress and manners, were as vulgar and revolting to their notions. The contumacious French hierarchy would render no allegiance whatever to the Venetians; the excommunication which the Patriarch fulminated against them they treated with sovereign contempt. The jealousy of the Franks against the Venetian Primate was not without ground. The Venetians had from the first determined to secure to themselves in perpetuity, and, as they could not accept the temporal dominion, to make the great ecclesiastical dignitaries hereditary in their nation; so to establish their own Popedom in the East. But Innocent had penetrated their design; he had rigidly defined the powers of the new Patriarch, and admonished him, before he left Rome, not to lend himself to the ambition of his country, to appoint the canons of Santa Sophia for their worth and knowledge, not for their Venetian birth; the Legate was to exercise a controlling power over these appointments. From Rome Morosini had proceeded to Venice, to embark for his Patriarchate. He had been received with bitter reproaches by the son of the Doge and many of the counsellors and nobles, as having betrayed his country; as having weakly aban-

doned to the Pope the rights and privileges of Venice. They threatened not to furnish him with a ship for his passage; he was deeply in debt, his creditors beset him on all sides; he was compelled to take an oath before the Senate that he would name none but Venetians, or at least those who had resided for ten years in the Venetian territory, as canons of Santa Sophia; and to take all possible measures that none but a Venetian should sit on the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople.<sup>t</sup> If even dim rumours of these stipulations had reached the French clergy, their cold reception of the Patriarch is at once explained. So deep, indeed, was the feud, that Innocent found it necessary to send another Legate to Constantinople, the Cardinal Benedict, who enjoyed his full and unlimited confidence. The former Legate to the East, Peter of Capua, with his colleague the Cardinal Soffrido, had caused great dissatisfaction to the Pope. He had released the Venetians from their interdict, he had deserted his proper province, the Holy Land; and, in a more open manner than Innocent thought prudent, entered into the great design for the subjugation of the Greek Empire. He had absolved the crusaders, on his own authority, from the fulfilment, for a limited period, of their vows to serve in Palestine. He had received a strong rebuke from Innocent, in which the Pope dwelt even with greater force on the cruelties, plunders, sacrileges committed after the storming of Constantinople. The Saracens in Palestine, instead of being kept in the salutary awe with which they had been struck by the capture of Constantinople, could

<sup>t</sup> Innocent heard of this extorted oath; he immediately addressed a letter to the Patriarch, positively prohibiting him from observing it; from the profane attempt to render the patriarchate hereditary among the Venetian aristocracy.—*Gesta, c. xc.*

not be ignorant that the Crusaders were now released from their vow of serving against them ; and would fall with tenfold fury on the few who remained to defend the Holy Land.

The Cardinal Benedict, of Santa Susanna, conducted<sup>a</sup> his office with consummate skill ; perhaps the disastrous state of affairs awed even the jealous clergy of the clergy. with the apprehension that their tenure of dignity was but precarious. The Emperor Baldwin had now fallen a captive into the hands of the King of Bulgaria ; his brother Henry, the new Sovereign, made head with gallantry, but with the utmost difficulty, against the Bulgarians, who, with their wild marauding

<sup>A.D. 1206.</sup> hordes, spread to the gates of Constantinople ;

Theodore Lascaris had established the new Greek Empire in Asia. The Cardinal not only reconciled the Frank clergy to the supremacy of the Patriarch, Morosini himself was inclined to the larger views of the churchman rather than the narrow and exclusive aims of the Venetian. He gladly accepted the Papal absolution from the oath extorted at Venice ; and, so far from the Venetians obtaining a perpetual and hereditary majority in the Chapter of Santa Sophia, or securing the descent of the Patriarchate in their nation, of the line of the Latin Patriarchs after Morosini there was but one of Venetian birth. The Legate established an ecclesiastical constitution for the whole Latin Empire. The clergy were to receive one-fifteenth of all possessions, cities, castles, tenements, fields, vineyards, groves, woods, meadows, suburban spaces, gardens, salt-works, tolls, customs by sea and land, fisheries in salt or fresh waters ; with some few exceptions in Constantinople and

its suburbs reserved for the Emperor himself. If the Emperor should compound for any territory, and receive tribute instead of possession, he was to be answerable for the fifteenth to the Church ; he could not grant any lands in fief, without reserving the fifteenth. Besides this, all monasteries belonged to the Church, and were not reckoned in the fifteenth. No monastery was to be fortified, if it should be necessary for the public defence, without the permission of the Patriarch or the Bishop of the diocese. Besides this, the clergy might receive tithe of corn, vegetables, and all the produce of the land ; of fruits, except the private kitchen-garden of the owner ; of the feed of cattle, of honey, and of wool. If by persuasion they could induce the landowners to pay these tithes, they were fully entitled to receive them. The clergy and the monks of all orders were altogether exempt, according to the more liberal custom of France, from all lay jurisdiction. They held their lands and possessions absolutely, saving only allegiance to the See of Rome and to the Patriarch of Constantinople, of the Emperor and of the Empire.\*

Even towards the Greeks, as the new Emperor discovered too late the fatal policy of treating the conquered race with contemptuous hatred, so the ecclesiastical rule gradually relaxed itself, and endeavoured to comprehend them without absolute abandonment of their ritual, and without the proscription of their clergy. Where the whole population was Greek, the Patriarch was recommended to appoint a Greek ecclesiastic ; only, where it was mixed, a Latin.<sup>v</sup> Even the Greek ritual was permitted where the obstinate

Toleration  
of Greeks.

\* Dated 16 Calends, April. Confirmed at Ferentino, Nones of August.

▼ *Gesta, ch. cii.*

worshippers resisted all persuasions to conformity, till the Holy See should issue further orders. Nor were the Greek monasteries to be suppressed, and converted, according to Latin usage, into secular chapters; they were to be replaced, as far as might be, by Latin regulars; otherwise to remain undisturbed. This tardy and extorted toleration had probably no great effect in allaying the deepening estrangement of the two churches. Nor did these arrangements pacify the Latin Byzantine Church; there were still jealousies among the Franks of the Venetian Patriarch, excommunications against his contumacious clergy by the Patriarch, appeals to Rome, attempts by the indignant Patriarch to resume A.D. 1209. some of the independence of his Byzantine predecessors, new Legatine commissions from the Pope, limiting or interfering with his authority.

Even had the Latin conquerors of the East the least disposition to resist the lofty dictation of the Kings of Bulgaria Pope in all ecclesiastical concerns, they were not in a situation to assert their independence as the undisputed sovereigns of Eastern Christendom. On Innocent might depend the recruiting of their reduced, scattered, insufficient forces by new adventurers assuming the Cross, and warring for the eventual liberation of the East, and so consolidating the conquest of the Eastern Empire; on Innocent might depend the deliverance of their captive Emperor, of whose fate they were still ignorant. The King of Bulgaria, by the submission of the Bulgarian Church to Rome, was the spiritual subject of the Pope. Henry, while yet Bailiff of the Empire, during the captivity of Baldwin, wrote the most pressing letters, entreating the mediation of the Pope with the subtle Johannitius. The letters described the insurrection of the perfidious Greeks, the

invasion of the Bulgarians, with their barbarous allied hordes, the fatal battle of Adrianople, in which Baldwin had been taken prisoner: the Latins fled to the Pope as their only refuge above all kings and princes of the earth; they threw themselves in prostrate humility at his parental feet.

Innocent delayed not to send a messenger to his spiritual vassal, the King of Bulgaria; but his letter was in a tone unwontedly gentle, persuasive, unauthoritative. He did not even throw the blame of the war with the Franks of Constantinople on the King of Bulgaria: he reminded him that he had received his crown and his consecrated banner from the Pope, that banner which had placed his kingdom under the special protection of St. Peter, in order that he might rule his realm in peace. He informed Johannitius that another immense army was about to set out from the West to recruit that which had conquered the Byzantine Empire; it was his interest, therefore, to make firm peace with the Latins, for which he had a noble opportunity by the deliverance of the Emperor Baldwin.\* “This was a suggestion, not a command. On his own part he would lay his injunction on the Emperor Henry to abstain from all invasion of the borders of Bulgaria; that kingdom, so devoutly dedicated to St. Peter and the Church of Rome, was to remain in its inviolable security!” The Bulgarian replied that “he had offered terms of peace to the Latins, which they had rejected with contempt; they had demanded the surrender of all the territories which they accused him of having usurped from the Empire of Constantinople, themselves being the usurpers of that Empire. These lands he occupied

by a better right than they Constantinople. He had received his crown from the Supreme Pontiff; they had violently seized and invested themselves with that of the Eastern Empire; the Empire which belonged to him rather than to them. He was fighting under the banner consecrated by St. Peter; they with the cross on their shoulders, which they had falsely assumed. He had been defied, had fought in self-defence, had won a glorious victory, which he ascribed to the intercession of the Prince of the Apostles. As to the Emperor, his release was impossible; he had already gone the way of all flesh." It is impossible not to remark the dexterity with which the Barbarian avails himself of the difficult position of the Pope, who had still openly condemned the invasion of Constantinople by the Crusaders, and had threatened, if he had not placed them under interdict for that act; how he makes himself out to be the faithful soldier of the Pope. Nor had either the awe or fear of Innocent restrained the King of Bulgaria from putting his prisoner to a cruel death (this seems to be certain, however the manner of Baldwin's death grew into a romantic legend.\*), nor did he pay the slightest regard to the pacific counsels of Rome; the consecrated banner of St. Peter still waved against those who had subdued the Eastern Empire under allegiance to the successor of St. Peter. Till his own assassination, Johannitus of Bulgaria was the dangerous and mortal foe of the Latins in the Empire of the East.

The conquest of Constantinople by the Latins, that strange and romantic episode in the history of the Cru-

---

\* Ephraim, l. 7406, 7, p. 300, | note on Villehardouin, and Alberic des edit. Bonn; Nicetas, p. 847; George Acropolita, p. 24, give different versions of his death. See also Ducange's | trois Fontaines, on the impostor who represented him.—Gesta Ludov. viii., apud Duchesne, Matt. Paris.

sades, in its direct and immediate results might seem but imperfect and transitory. The Latin Empire endured hardly more than half a century, the sovereignty reverted to its old effete masters. The Greeks who won back the throne were in no respect superior either in military skill or valour, in genius, in patriotism, in intellectual eminence, to those who had been dispossessed by the Latins. The Byzantine Empire had to linger out a few more centuries of inglorious inactivity ; her religion came back with her, with all its superstition, with nothing creative, vigorous, or capable of exercising any strong impulse on the national mind. As the consolidation therefore of Europe into one great Christian confederacy the conquest was a signal failure ; as advancing, as supporting the Christian outposts in the East, it led to no result ; the Crusades languished still more and more ; they were now the enterprises of single enthusiastic princes, brilliant, adventurous expeditions like that of our Edward I.; even national armaments like those of St. Louis of France, whom his gallant chivalry followed to the East as they would on any other bold campaign, obedient to, even kindled by, his fanatic fervour, rather than by their own profound religious zeal. They were no longer the wars of Christendom, the armed insurrections of whole populations, maddening to avenge the cause of the injured Son of God, to secure to themselves the certain absolution for their sins and everlasting reward.

But the immediate and indirect results on the Latin and more especially on the Italian mind, constituted the profound importance of this event, and were at once the sign and the commencement of a great revolution. A new element had now entered into society, to contest

Effects of  
conquest  
of Constan-  
tinople.

with the warlike and religious spirit the dominion over human thought. Commercial Venice had now taken her place with the feudal monarchies of Transalpine Christendom, and with Rome the seat of ecclesiastical supremacy. A new power had arisen, which had wrested the generalship and the direction of a Crusade from the hands of the most mighty prelate who had filled the chair of St. Peter, had calmly pursued her own way in defiance of interdict, and only at her own convenient time, and for her own ends, stooped to tardy submission and apology.

Venice almost alone reaped the valuable harvest of <sup>Advantages secured by</sup> this great Crusade. Zara was the first step to her wide commercial empire; she had wisely left the more imposing but precarious temporal sovereignty in Constantinople to her confederates; to them she abandoned whatever kingdoms, principalities, or baronial fiefs they might win upon the mainland; but she seized on the islands of the Archipelago as her own. Constantinople was not her seat of empire, but it was her central mart; the Emperor had to defend the walls on the land side, the factories of Venice at Pera were amply protected by her fleets. Wherever there was a haven there waved the flag of St. Mark: the whole coast and all the islands were studded with her mercantile establishments.

Venice had been thwarted by the natural jealousy of the Church, by the vigilance and authority of the Pope, and by the defection of Morosini himself, her Patriarch, in her bold project of retaining in her own hands the chief ecclesiastical dignity of the new Empire. It was a remarkable part of the Venetian policy, that though jealous of any overweening ecclesiastical authority at home, within her own lagunes; abroad, in her colonies

and conquests, she was desirous of securing to herself and her sons all the high spiritual dignities, and so to hold both the temporal and ecclesiastical power in her own hands. Venice, by her fortune, or by her sagacity, had never become, never aspired to become the seat of an archiepiscopate; the city was a province first of Aquileia, then of Grado; but the Archbishop was no citizen of Venice; he dwelt apart in his own city; he was at times a stately visitor, received with the utmost ceremony, but still only a visitor in Venice; he could not be a resident rival and control upon the Doge and the senators. Hence Venice alone remained comparatively free from ecclesiastical intrigue; the clergy took no part, as clergy, in the affairs of state; they had no place in the successive senatorial bodies, which at different periods of the constitution ruled the republic. Hence, even from an earlier period she dared to take a firmer tone, or to treat with courteous disrespect the mandates of the supreme Pontiff; the Republic would sternly assert her right to rule herself of her own sole and exclusive authority; but in her settlements she would not disdain to rule by the subsidiary aid of the ecclesiastical power.

Among the first acts of Ziani, the Doge who succeeded Henry Dandolo, was the appointment of the Abbot of St. Felix in Venice to the archbishopric of Zara; he obtained the consecration and confirmation from the obsequious Primate of Grado. Not till then did he condescend to request the Papal sanction; to demand the pall for the new archbishop.

Innocent seized the opportunity of abasing the pride of Venice, of disburthening his mind of all his wrath, perhaps his prescient apprehensions of her future unruliness. "We have thought it right in our patient love

to rebuke your ambassadors for the many and heinous sins wickedly committed against God, the Roman Church, and the whole Christian people—the destruction of Zara; the diversion of the army of the Lord, which ought not to have moved to the right or the left, from their lawful enemies the perfidious Saracens, against faithful Christian nations; the contumelious repulse of the Legate of the Roman See; the contempt of our excommunication; the violation of the vow of the Cross in despite of the crucified Saviour. Among these enormous misdeeds we will not name those perpetrated in Constantinople, the pillage of the treasures of the Church, the seizure of her possessions, the attempt to make the sanctuary of the Lord hereditary in your nation by extorting unlawful oaths. What reparation can ye make for this loss to the Holy Land by your misguiding to your own ends an army so noble, so powerful, raised at such enormous cost, which might not only have subdued the Holy Land, but even great part of the kingdom of Egypt? If it has been able to subdue Constantinople and the Greek Empire, how much easier Alexandria and Egypt, and so have obtained quiet possession of Palestine? Ascribe it not then to our severity, but to your own sins, that we refuse to admit the Abbot of St. Felix, whom ye call Archbishop of Zara. It would be a just offence to all Christian people if we should seem thus to sanction your iniquity in the seizure of Zara, by granting the pall of an archbishop in that city to a prelate of your nomination.”<sup>b</sup>

The Pope called on the Venetians to submit and make satisfaction for all their crimes against the Holy See;

---

<sup>b</sup> *Gesta, civ.*

on making that submission he would suspend the censure which the whole world expected to fall on the contumacious republic. We hear not that Venice trembled at this holy censure ; history records no proof of her fear or submission.

A.D. 1206.

Through Venice flowed into Western Europe almost all those remains of ancient art, and even of ancient letters, which had some effect in awakening the slumbering genius of Latin Europe. The other western kingdoms were content mostly with reliques ; perhaps the great marts of Flanders, and the rising Hanse Towns had some share, more or less direct, in Eastern commerce ; but besides the religious spoils, Venice alone, and through Venice Italy, was moved with some yet timid admiration of profaner works, such as the horses of Lysippus, which now again stand in her great Place of St. Mark. Venice, after the conquest of Constantinople, became a half Byzantine city. Her great church of St. Mark still seems as if it had migrated from the East ; its walls glow with Byzantine mosaic ; its treasures are Oriental in their character as in their splendour.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Innocent and the Anti-Sacerdotalists.

THE Crusades had established in the mind of men the maxim that the Infidel was the enemy of God, and therefore the enemy of every true servant of God. The war, first undertaken for a specific object, the rescue of the Saviour's sepulchre, that indefeasible property of Christ and Christendom long usurped by lawless force, from the profane and sacrilegious hands of the Mohammedan idolaters (as they were absurdly called), had now become a general war of the Cross against the Crescent, of every Christian against every believer in the Korân. Christian and unbeliever were born foes, foes unto death. They might hold the chivalrous gallantry, the loyalty, and the virtue, each of the other, in respect: absolute necessity might compel them to make treaties which would partake in the general sanctity of such covenants; yet to these irreconcileable antagonists war was the state of nature; each considered it a sacred duty, if not a positive obligation, to extirpate the hostile faith. And in most Mohammedan countries the Christian had the claim of old possession; he fought for the recovery of his own. Mohammedanism had begun in unprovoked conquest; conquest was its sole tenure; and conquest might seem at least a part of its religion, for with each successive race which rose to power among the Mohammedans the career of invasion began again; the frontiers of Christendom were invested

or driven in. All warfare, therefore, even carried into the heart of Mohammedanism, was in some degree defensive, as precautionary and preventive of future aggression ; as aspiring to crush, before it became too formidable, a power which inevitably, when again matured, would be restrained by no treaty. Foreign subjugation, subjugation of Christian countries, was at once a part of the creed, and of the national manners. The Nomad races, organised by a fanatic faith, were arrayed in eternal warfare against more settled and peaceful civilisation. The Crusades in the North of Germany against the tribes of Teutonic or Sclavonian race might claim, though in less degree, the character of defensive wars : those races too were mostly warlike and aggressive. The Teutonic knights were the religious and chivalrous descendants of the Templars and the Hospitallers.<sup>a</sup>

But according to the theory of the Church, the erring believer was as declared an enemy to God as the Pagan or the Islamite, in one respect more inexcusable and odious, as obstinately resisting or repudiating the truth. The heretic appeared to the severely orthodox Christian as worse than the unbeliever : he was a revolted subject, not a foreign enemy.<sup>b</sup> Civil wars are always the most ferocious. Excommunication from the Christian Church implied outlawry from Christian society ; the heretic forfeited not only all dignities, rights, privileges, immu-

<sup>a</sup> The Teutonic order was as yet in its infancy ; it obtained what may be called an European existence (till then it was a brotherhood of charity in the Holy Land) under Herman de Salza, the loyal friend of Frederick II.

<sup>b</sup> The Troubadour who sings of the Albigensian war expresses the common sentiment : "Car les François de France, et ceux d'Italie . . . et le monde entier leur court sus, et leur porte haine, plus qu'à Sarrasins."—Fauriel, p. 77.

nities, even all property, all protection by law; he was to be pursued, taken,<sup>c</sup> despoiled, put to death, either by the ordinary course of justice (the temporal authority was bound to execute, even to blood, the sentence of the ecclesiastical court), or if he dared to resist, by any means whatever: however peaceful, he was an insurgent, against whom the whole of Christendom might, or rather was bound at the summons of the spiritual power to declare war; his estates, even his dominions if a sovereign, were not merely liable to forfeiture, but the Church assumed the power of awarding the forfeiture, as it might seem best to her wisdom.<sup>d</sup> The army which should execute the mandate of the Church was the army of the Church, and the banner of that army was the Cross of Christ. So began Crusades, not on the contested borders of Christendom, not in Mohammedan or heathen lands, in Palestine, on the shores of the Nile, among the Livonian forests or the sands of the Baltic, but in the very bosom of Christendom; not among the implacable partisans of an antagonistic creed, but among those who still called themselves by the name of Christians.

The world, at least the Christian world, might seem to repose in unresisting and unrepinning subjection under the religious autocracy of the Pope, now at the zenith of his power. However Innocent III., in his ostentatious claim of complete temporal supremacy as a branch of his spiritual power,

<sup>c</sup> Pierre de Vaux Cernay considers every crime to be centered in heresy. The heretic is a wild beast, to be remorselessly slain wherever he is found.—*Passim.*

<sup>d</sup> Even the Emperor Henry IV.

<sup>a</sup> Apparent religious quiet of reign of Innocent III. almost admitted that, if guilty of heresy, he would have justly incurred dethronement. His argument against the injustice of Hildebrand is, that he is convicted of no heresy.

as directly flowing from the established principles of his religious despotism, might have to encounter the stern opposition of the temporal sovereigns Philip of Swabia, Otho IV., Philip Augustus, or the Barons of England; yet within its clear and distinct limits that supremacy was uncontested. No Emperor or King, however he might assert his right to his crown in defiance of the Pope, would fail at the same time to profess himself a dutiful son and subject of the Church. Where the contest arose out of matters more closely connected with religion, it was against the alleged abuse of the power, not against the power itself, which he appealed when he took up arms. But there was a secret working in the depths of society, which, at the very moment when it was most boastful of its unity, broke forth in direct spiritual rebellion in almost every quarter of Christendom. Nor was it the more watchful and all-pervading administration of Innocent III., which detected latent and slumbering heresies; they were open and undisguised, and carried on the work of proselytism, each in its separate sphere, with dauntless activity. From almost every part of Latin Christendom a cry of indignation and distress is raised by the clergy against the teachers or the sects, which are withdrawing the people from their control. It is almost simultaneously heard in England, in Northern France, in Belgium, in Bretagne, in the whole diocese of Rheims, in Orleans, in Paris, in Germany, at Goslar, Cologne, Trèves, Metz, Strasburg. Throughout the whole South of France, and it should seem in Hungary, this sectarianism is the dominant religion. Even in Italy these opinions had made alarming progress. Innocent himself calls on the cities of Verona, Bologna, Florence, Milan, Placentia, Treviso, Bergamo, Mantua, Ferrara, Faenza, to cast out these

multiplying sectaries. Even within or on the very borders of the Papal territory Viterbo is the principal seat of the revolt.

In one great principle alone the heresiarchs of this Principle of age, and their countless sects, conspired with union amongst Sectaries dangerous unity. It was a great anti-sacerdotal movement; it was a convulsive effort to throw off what had become to many the intolerable yoke of a clergy which assumed something beyond Apostolic power, and seemed to have departed so entirely from Apostolic poverty and humility. It was impossible that the glaring contrast between the simple religion of the Gospel, and the vast hierarchical Christianity which had been growing up since the time of Constantine, should not, even in the darkest and most ignorant age awaken the astonishment of some, and rouse a spirit of inquiry in others. But for centuries, from this embarrassing or distressing contrast between Apostolic and hierarchical Christianity, almost all who had felt it had sought and found refuge in monachism. And monachism, having for its main object the perfection of the individual, was content to withdraw itself out of worldly Christianity into safe seclusion; being founded on a rule, an universal rule, of passive submission, it did not of necessity feel called upon, or seem to itself justified in more than protesting against, or condemning by its own austere indigence, the inordinate wealth, power, or splendour of the clergy, still less in organising revolutionary resistance. Yet unquestionably this oppugnancy was the most active element in the jealous hostility between the seculars and the regulars, which may be traced in almost every country and in every century. We have heard the controversy between Peter Damiani and Hildebrand, each of whom may be accepted as

the great champion of his class, which though it did not quench their mutual respect, even their friendship, shows the irreconcileability of the conflict. Yet each form of monasticism had in a generation or two become itself hierarchical ; the rich and lordly abbot could not reproach the haughty and wealthy bishop as an unworthy successor of the Apostles. Clugny, which by its stern austerities had put to shame the older cloisters, by the time of St. Bernard is become the seat of unevangelical luxury and ease. Moreover, a solemn and rigid ritual devotion was an essential part of monachism. Each rule was more punctilious, more minute, more strict, than the ordinary ceremonial of the Church ; and this rigid servitude to religious usage no doubt kept down multitudes, who might otherwise have raised or followed the standard of revolt. There were no rebellions to any extent in the monastic orders, so long as they were confined in their cloisters ; it was not till much later, that among the Begging Friars, who wandered freely abroad, arose a formidable mutiny, even in the very camp of the Papacy.

The hierarchy, too, might seem to repose securely in its conscious strength ; to look back with quiescent pride on its unbroken career of victory. The intellectual insurrection of Abélard against the dominant philosophy and against the metaphysic groundwork, if not against the doctrine, of the dominant Christianity, had been crushed, for a time at least, by his own calamities and by the superior authority of St. Bernard. The republican religion of Arnold of Brescia had met its doom at the stake ; the temporal and spiritual power had combined to trample down the perilous demagogue rather than heresiarch. But doctrines expire not with their teachers. Abélard left even in high places, if not

disciples, men disposed to follow out his bold speculations. But these were solitary abstruse thinkers, like Gilbert de la Porée, or minds which formed a close esoteric school; no philosophising Christian ever organised or perpetuated a sect. Arnold no doubt left behind him a more deep and dangerous influence. In many minds there lingered from his teaching, if no very definite notions, a secret reactionary repugnance to the established opinions, an unconscious aversion to the rule of the sacerdotal order.

The Papacy, the whole hierarchy, might seem, in the Security wantonness of its despotism, almost deliberately to drive Christendom to insurrection. It was impossible that the long, seemingly interminable conflict with the imperial power, even though it might end in triumph, should not leave deep and rankling and inextinguishable animosities. The interdicts uttered, not against monarchs, but against kingdoms like France and England; the sudden and total cessation of all religious rites; the remorseless abandonment, as it were, of whole nations to everlasting perdition for the sins or alleged sins of their sovereigns, could not but awaken doubts; deaden in many cases religious fears—madden to religious desperation. In France it has been seen that satire began to aim its contemptuous sarcasms at the Pope and the Papal power. In the reign of John, the political songs, not merely in the vernacular tongue but in priestly or monastic Latin, assume a boldness and vehemence which show how much the old awe is dropping off; and these songs, spread from convent to convent, and chanted by monks, it should seem, to holy tunes, are at once the expression and the nutriment of brooding and sullen discontent: discontent, if as yet shuddering at aught approaching to

heresy, at least preparing men's minds for doctrinal licence.<sup>6</sup>

Nor were the highest churchmen aware how by their own unsparing and honest denunciations of the abuses of the Church, they must shake the authority of the Church. The trumpet of sedition was blown from the thrones of bishops and archbishops, of holy abbots and preachers of the severest orthodoxy; and was it to be expected that the popular mind would nicely discriminate between the abuses of the hierarchical system and the system itself? The flagrant, acknowledged venality of Rome could not be denounced without impairing the majesty of Rome; the avarice of Legates and Cardinals could not pass into a proverb and obtain currency from the most unsuspecting authorities, without bringing Legates, Cardinals, the whole hierarchy into contempt.

\* See Mr. Wright's Political songs and poems of Walter de Mapes, among the most curious volumes published by the Camden Society. In the *Carmina Burana* (from the monastery of Benedict Buren, published by the Literary Union of Stutgard, 1847) we find the same pieces, some no doubt of English origin. This strange collection of amatory as well as satirical pieces shows that the licence, even occasionally the grace and beauty of the Troubadour, as well as his bitter tone against the clergy, were not confined to the South of France, or to the Provençal tongue:—

*Cum ad papam veneris, habe pro constanti  
Non est locus pauperi, soli favet danti;  
Vel si munus præstatum non est aliquanti.  
Respondet, hec tibia non est michi tauit.  
Papa, si rem tangimus nomen habet a re;  
Quicquid habent alii, solus vult palpare;  
Vel si verbum gallicum vis apocopare,  
*Paez, paez, dit le mot, si vis impetrare.*  
Papa querit, chartula querit, bullia querit,  
I'orta querit, cardinalis querit, cursor  
querit,*

*Omnis querunt; et si quod des, un.  
deerit,  
Totum mare salsum est, tota causa perit.'*  
—p. 14, 18

Here is another, out of many such passages:—

*"Roma, turpitudinis jacens in profundis,  
Virtutes prepsterat opibus immundis  
Vacillantis animi fluctuant sub undis,  
Diruit, adficat, mutat quadrata rotundis.  
Roma cunctos erudit, ut ad opes trans-  
volent,  
Plus quam Deo, Mammonæ, cor et manus  
immolet;  
Sic nimirus palmites malæ stirpe re-  
dolent:  
Cui caput infirmum, cetera membra  
dolent."*

From another publication of Mr. Wright's, "Early Mysteries," p. xxv. —

*"Quicquid male, Roma, vales,  
I'er immundos cardinales,  
Perque nugas Decretales;  
Quicquid cancellaril  
Peccant vel notarii,  
Totum cameraril  
Superant Papales."*

—Compare Hist. Littér. de la France, vol. xxii. 147, 8. I had selected the same quotations.

We have heard Becket declaim, if not against the Pope himself (yet even the Pope is not spared), against the court and council of the Pope as bought and sold. The King, he says, boasts that he has in his pay the whole college of cardinals; he could buy the Papacy itself, if vacant. And, if Becket brands the impiety, he does not question on this point the truth of the King. Becket's friend, John of Salisbury, not only in the freedom of epistolary writing, but in his grave philosophic works, dwells, if with trembling reverence yet with no less force, on this indelible sin of Rome and of the legates of Rome.<sup>f</sup> We have heard Innocent compelled to defend himself from the imputed design of fraudulently alienating for his own use contributions raised for the hallowed purposes of the Crusade.

All these conspiring causes account for the popularity <sup>Movement anti-Sacerdotalist</sup> of this movement; its popularity, not on account of the numbers of its votaries, but the class in which it chiefly spread: the lower or middle orders of the cities, in many cases the burghers, now also striving after civil liberties, and forming the free municipalities in the cities; and in those cities not merely opposing the authority of the nobles, but that not less oppressive of the bishops and the chapters.

This wide-spread, it might seem almost simultaneous revolt throughout Latin Christianity (though in fact it had been long growing up, and, beat down in one place, had ever risen in another); this insurrection against the dominion of the clergy and of the Pope, more or less against the vital doctrines of the faith, but universally against the sacerdotal system, comprehended three

<sup>f</sup> "Sed Legati sedis Apostolice manus suas excutiant ab omni munere, qui interdum in provincias ita debacchantur ac si ad ecclesiam flagellandam egressus sit Sathan a facie domini." He adds, "Non de omnibus serm est."—Polycratic. v. 15.

classes. These, distinct in certain principles and tenets, would of necessity intermingle incessantly, melt into, and absorb each other. Once broken loose from the authority of the clergy, once convinced that the clergy possessed not the sure, at all events, not the exclusive power over their salvation ; awe and reverence for the churches, for the sacraments, for the confessional, once thrown aside ; they would welcome any new excitement ; be the willing and eager hearers of any teacher who renounced the hierarchy. The followers of Peter de Brueys, or of Henry the Deacon, in the South of France, would be ready to listen without terror to the zealous and eloquent Manichean ; the first bold step was already taken ; they would go onward without fear, without doubt, wherever conviction seemed to flash upon their minds or enthrall their hearts. In most of them probably the thirst was awakened, rather than fully allayed ; they were searchers after truth, rather than men fully satisfied with their new creed.

These three classes were—I. The simple Anti-Sacerdotalists, those who rejected the rites and repudiated the authority of the clergy, but did not depart, or departed but in a slight degree, from the established creeds ; heretics in manners and in forms of worship rather than in articles of belief. These were chiefly single teachers, who rose in different countries, without connexion, without organisation, each dependent for his success on his own eloquence or influence. They were insurgents, who shook the established government, but did not attempt to replace it by any new form or system of opinions and discipline.

II. The Waldenses, under whom I am disposed, after much deliberation, to rank the Poor Men of Lyons. These may be called the Biblical Anti-Sacerdotalists.

The appeal to the Scriptures and to the Scriptures alone from the vast system of traditional religion, was their vital fundamental tenet.

III. The Manicheans, characterised not only by some of the leading doctrines of the old Oriental system, not probably clearly defined or understood, by a severe asceticism, and a hatred or contempt of all union between the sexes, but also by a peculiar organisation, a severe probation, a gradual and difficult ascent into the chosen ranks of the Perfect, with something approaching to a hierarchy of their own.

I. Not long after the commencement of the twelfth century, Peter de Brueys preached in the south of France for above twenty years.<sup>s</sup> At length he expiated his rebellion in the flames at St. Gilles in Languedoc. Peter de Brueys had been a clerk; he is taunted as having deserted the Church on account of the poverty of his benefice. He denied infant baptism, it is said, because the parents brought not their children with offerings; he annulled the sacrifice of the altar, because men came not with their hands and bosoms loaded with gifts and with wax-lights.

Peter de Brueys is arraigned by Peter the Venerable, as denying — I. Infant baptism. II. Respect for churches. III. The worship of the cross. The cross on which the Redeemer was so cruelly tortured, ought rather to be an object of horror than of veneration. IV. Transubstantiation and the Real Presence. It is

<sup>s</sup> The date is doubtful. Peter the Venerable wrote his confutation after the death of Peter de Brueys: he asserts that Peter had disseminated his heresy in the dioceses of Arles, Embrun, Die, and Gap: he afterwards

went into the province of Narbonne. Baronius dated this work of Peter the Venerable in 1146. Clemencet in 1135. Fuesslin, a more modern authority, with whom Gieseler agrees, is 1126 or 1127.

asserted, but not proved, that he rejected the Eucharist altogether; he probably retained it as a memorial rite. V. Prayers, alms, and oblations for the dead. To these errors was added an aversion to the chanting and psalmody of the Church; he would perhaps replace it by a more simple and passionate hymnology.<sup>b</sup> How did each of these heretical tenets strike at the power, the wealth, the influence of the clergy! What terrible doubts did they throw into men's minds! How hateful must they have appeared to the religious, as to the irreligious! "What!" says the indignant Peter the Venerable, on the first of these tenets (we follow not out his curious, at times strange refutation of the rest), "have all the saints been baptised in infancy, yet, if infant baptism be null, have perished unbaptised, perished therefore eternally? Is there no Christian, not one to be saved in all Spain, Gaul, Germany, Italy, Europe?" In another respect the followers of Peter de Brueys rejected the usages of the Church, but in no rigid or ascetic, and therefore no Manichean spirit. They ate meat on fast days, even on Good Friday. They even summoned their people to feast on those days. This was among the most revolting acts of their wickedness; as bad as acts of persecution and cruelty, of which they are accused; it shows at once their daring and the great power which they had attained. "The people are rebaptised, altars thrown down, crosses burned, meat publicly eaten on the day of the Lord's Passion, priests scourged, monks imprisoned, or compelled to marry by terror or by torture"<sup>i</sup>

<sup>b</sup> Compare Flathe, Vorlaufer der Reformation, Hahn, Manichaëische Ketzer, p. 408, *et seqq.*

<sup>i</sup> Peter Venerab., in Max. Biblioth.

Patr., p. 1034. This refutation is the chief authority about Peter de Brueys, and his followers, called Petribussians.

But the fire which burned Peter de Brueys neither discouraged nor silenced a more powerful and more daring heresiarch. To the five errors of de <sup>Henry the</sup> Deacon.<sup>1</sup> Brueys, his heir, Henry the Deacon, added many more.<sup>k</sup> The description of the person, the habits, the eloquence of Henry, as it appeared to the incensed clergy, is more distinct than that of his doctrines. Henry had been a monk of Clugny, and was in deacon's orders. He is first heard of at Lausanne (though according to some reports his career began in Italy), but his influence over the popular mind and his hostility to the clergy first broke forth in its fulness at Le Mans. The Bishop of that see, Hildebert, incautiously gave him permission to preach, and then departed himself on a visit to Rome. The rapid changes in Henry's countenance are likened to a stormy sea: his hair was cropped, his beard long; he was tall of stature, quick in step, barefooted in the midst of winter, rapid in address, in voice terrible. In years he was but a youth; yet his deep tones seemed, according to the appalled clergy of Le Mans, like the roar of legions of devils; but he was wonderfully eloquent. He went to the very hearts of men, and maddened them to a deep implacable hatred of the clergy. Yet at first some even of the clergy sate at the feet of the persuasive teacher and melted into tears. But as he rose to the stern denunciation of their vices, they saw their alienated flocks gradually look on them with apathy, with contempt, with aversion. Some who attempted to meet the preacher in argument were beaten, rolled in the mire, hardly escaped with their lives, were only pro-

---

<sup>k</sup> Acta Episcoporum Cenomansium (in Mabillon, *Vet. Analect.* iii. 312). Henry began in 1116.

tected, and in secret hiding-places, by the magistrates. They attempted a gentle remonstrance: they had received Henry with brotherly love, and opened their pulpits to him; he had returned peace with enmity, sowed deadly hatred between the clergy and the people, and betrayed them with a Judas kiss. To the messenger who read this expostulation Henry sternly and briefly replied, "Thou liest." But for the officers of the Count who accompanied him the man had been stoned to death.

Henry was no Manichean; he was rather an apostle of marriage. His influence, like that of many of the popular preachers, was greatest among the loose women. That unhappy race, of strong passions, oppressed with shame and misery at their outcast and forlorn condition, are ever prone to throw themselves into wild paroxysms of penitence. They stripped themselves, if we are to believe the accounts, naked; threw their costly robes, their bright tresses, into the fire. Henry declared that no one should receive a dowry, gold, silver, land, or bridal gifts. All rushed to marriage, the poorest with the poorest, *even within the prohibited degrees*. Henry himself is said to have looked with too curious and admiring eyes on the beauty of his adoring proselytes. Young men of rank and station wedded these reclaimed harlots in coarse robes which cost the meanest price. These inauspicious marriages ended but ill. The passion of self-sacrifice soon burned out in the youths; they grew weary, and deserted their once contaminated wives. The passion of virtue with the women, too, died away; they fell back to their old courses.

Bishop Hildebert, on his return from Rome, was met by no procession, no rejoicing at the gates. The people mocked his blessing: "We have a father, a bishop, far above thee in dignity, wisdom, and holiness." The mild

Bishop bore the affront : he forced an interview on Henry, and put him under examination. Henry knew not how—probably refused—to repeat the Morning Hymn. The Bishop declared him a poor ignorant man, but took no harsher measure than expulsion from his diocese.

Henry retired to the South of France, and joined Peter de Brueys as his scholar or fellow apostle. After Brueys was burned, he retired into Gascony, fell into the hands of the Archbishop of Arles, and

A.D. 1134.

was sent to the Council of Pisa. Innocent II. condemned him to silence, and placed him under the custody of St. Bernard. He escaped and returned to Languedoc. Desertion of churches, total contempt of the clergy, followed the eloquent heresiarch wherever he went. The Cardinal Bishop of Ostia was sent by Eugene III. to subdue the revolt ; the Cardinal Alberic demanded the aid of no less a colleague than St. Bernard : “Henry is an antagonist who can only be put down by the conqueror of Abélard and of Arnold of Brescia.” Bernard’s progress in Languedoc might seem an uncontested ovation : from all quarters crowds gathered ; Toulouse opened her gates ; he is said by his powerful discourses to have disinfected the whole city from heresy. He found, so he writes, “the churches without people, the people without priests, the priests without respect, the Christians without Christ, the churches are deemed synagogues, the holy places of God denied to be holy, the sacraments are no longer sacred, the holy days without their solemnities.” Bernard left Toulouse, as he hoped, as his admirers boasted, restored to peace and orthodoxy.<sup>m</sup>

Yet Bernard’s victory was but seeming or but tran-

sient. Peter de Brueys and Henry the Deacon had only sowed the dragon seed of worse heresies, which sprung up with astonishing rapidity. Before fifty years had passed the whole South of France was swarming with Manicheans, who took their name from the centre of their influence, the city of Albi. Toulouse is become, in the words of its delegated visitors (the Cardinal of S. Chrysogonus, the Abbot of Clairvaux, the Bishops of Poitiers and Bath), the abomination of desolation ; the heretics have the chief power over the people, they lord it among the clergy : as the people, so the priest.<sup>n</sup>

The Anti-Sacerdotalists had at the same time,<sup>o</sup> or even earlier, found in the north a formidable head in Tanchelin of Antwerp, a layman, with his disciple, a renegade priest named Erwacher. Tanchelin appears more like one of the later German Anabaptists. He rejected Pope, archbishops, bishops, the whole priesthood. His sect was the one true Church. The Sacraments (he denied transubstantiation) depended for their validity on the holiness of him who administered them. He declared war against tithes and the possessions of the Church. He was encircled by a body-guard of three thousand armed men ; he was worshipped by the people as an angel, or something higher ; they drank the water in which he had bathed. He is accused of the grossest licence. A woman within the third degree of relationship was his concubine. Tanchelin began his career in the cities on the coast of

<sup>n</sup> "Ita hæretici principabantur in populo, dominabantur in clero ; eo quod populus, sic sacerdos," *et seqq.* Epist. Henric. Abbat. Clairv. apud Mansi, A.D. 1178 ; and in Maitland, *Facts and Documents*.

<sup>o</sup> From 1100 to 1125. Script. apud Bouquet, xiii. 108, *et seqq.* Epist. Frag. Ecclesiae. Sigebert, apud Pertz, viii. Vita Norberti, apud Bolland, Jun. 1. Hahn, p. 459.

Flanders; he then fixed himself at Utrecht. The bishops and clergy raised a cry of terror. Yet Tan-chelin, with the renegade Erwacher, dared to visit Rome. On his return he was seized and imprisoned in Cologne by the Archbishop, escaped, first fixed himself in Bruges, finally in Antwerp, where he ruled with the power and state of a king. He was at length struck dead by a priest, but his followers survived; no less a man than St. Norbert, the friend, almost the equal of St. Bernard, was compelled to accept the bishopric of Utrecht, to quell the brooding and dangerous revolt.

Another wild teacher, Eudo de Stella, an illiterate rustic, half-revolutionised Bretagne. He gave himself out "as he that should come," was followed by multitudes, and assumed almost kingly power. He was with difficulty seized; his life was spared; he was cast into prison under the charge of Suger, Abbot of St. Denys. He died in prison; his only known tenet is implacable hostility to churches and monasteries.<sup>p</sup>

These, though the most famous, or best recorded Anti-Sacerdotalists, who called forth the Bernards and the Norberts to subdue them, were not the only teachers of these rebellious doctrines. In many other cities nothing is known, but that fires were kindled and heretics burned, in Oxford, in Rheims, in Arras, in Besançon, in Cologne, in Trèves, in Vezelay.<sup>q</sup> In this latter stately monastery, probably a year or two before the excommunication of King Henry's friends by Becket, that awful triumph

<sup>p</sup> *Gul. Neubrig.* sub ann. 1197. *Continuat. Sigebert,* apud Pertz, viii.

<sup>q</sup> Some of these may have been Manicheans, or held opinions bordering on Manicheanism. On Oxford, *Gul. Neubrig.* ii. c. 13. *Arras,* in 1183,

perhaps 1083. *Besançon,* 1200. *Cæsar Heisterbac,* v. 15. *Cologne,* God. Monach. ad ann. 1163. *Trèves, Gesta Trevir.* i. 186. They passed under the general name of Cathari; in France they were often called tisserands (weavers).

of the sacerdotal power, the Archbishops of Lyons and Narbonne, the Bishops of Nevers and Laon, and many abbots and great theologians, sate in solemn judgement on some, it should seem, poor ignorant men, called Publicans.<sup>r</sup> They denied all but God; they absolutely rejected all the Sacraments, infant baptism, the Eucharist, the sign of the cross, holy water, the efficacy of tithes and oblations, marriages, monkhood, the power and functions of the priesthood. Two were disposed to recant. They were examined at the solemn festival of Easter, article by article; they could not explain their own tenets. They were allowed the water ordeal. One passed through safe; the other case was more doubtful, the man was plunged again, and condemned, to the general satisfaction. But the Abbot having some doubt, he was put to a more merciful death. Appeal was made to the whole assembly: "What shall be done with the rest?" "Let them be burned! let them be burned!" And burned they were, to the number of seven, in the valley of Ecouan.<sup>s</sup>

II. In Northern France these adversaries of the Church seem to have been less inclined to <sup>Biblical Anti-Sacer-</sup> speculative than to practical innovations. It <sup>dotalists.</sup> was an hostility to the clergy, and to all those ritual and sacramental institutions in which dwelt the power

\* Idonei or popolicolæ.

\* Historia Vezeliac. sub fine, in Guizot, Collection des Mémoires, vii. p. 335. All these burnings were by the civil power, to which the heretics, having been excommunicated, were given up. Yet Eichhorn observes that neither the law of the Church nor the Roman law had any general penalty against heretics beyond confis-

cation of goods. "Obschon weder ein Kirchengesetz noch das Römische Recht etwas anderes als confiscation ihres vermögens *allgemein* gebot." Two statutes of Frederick II. (A.D. 1222) made the punishment, which had become practice law. "Welche allgemeine Praxis wurden, in Verbrennen bestehen sollte."—T. ii. p. 521.

and authority of the clergy. In Southern France Manicheism almost suddenly swallowed up the followers of the simple Anti-Sacerdotalists, Peter de Brueys and Henry the Deacon. In Italy, perhaps, the political element, introduced by Arnold of Brescia, mingled with the Paulician Manicheism which stole in after the Crusades, and appeared almost simultaneously in many parts of Europe. In the valleys of the Alps it was a pure religious movement. Peter Waldo was the St. Francis of heresy, the Poor Men of Lyons were the Minorites—the lowest of the low. Some of them resembled more the later Fraticelli in their levelling doctrines, in their assertion of the kingdom of the Spirit; in some respects the wilder Anabaptists of the Church of Rome.

The simplicity of the Alpine peasants was naturally averse to the wealth of the monastic establishments which began to arise among them; there might survive some vague tradition of the iconoclasm and holiness of Claudius of Turin, or of the later residence of Arnold of Brescia in Zurich. But whether the spiritual parents, the brethren, the offspring of Peter Waldo<sup>t</sup>—whether

<sup>t</sup> The date of Waldo is doubtful from 1160 to 1170. Stephanus de Borbone de VII. *Donis Spiritus*, iv. c. 30, professes to have heard the origin of the sect from persons living at the time. The passage is quoted in the Dissertation of Ricchinius, prefixed to *Moneta*, c. xxxvii. The two famous lines in the Noble Leyczon appear to assign a proximate date to the Biblical Anti-Sacerdotalists of the Valleys:—

"Ben ha mil e cent anez complentierament,  
Que fo scripta l' ora, car son al denier  
temp."

I see no reason for, every reason against,

reckoning these 1100 years from the delivery of the Apocalypse, a critical question far beyond the age, or from any period but the ordinary date of our Lord. All it seems to assert is that the 1100 years are fully passed, and that the "latter days" are begun. This in the usual religious language would admit, at least, any part of the twelfth century. The authenticity of these lines is asserted and argued to my mind in a conclusive manner by the highest authority, Mons. Raynouard, *Poésies des Troubadours*, vol. ii. p. cxlii. Compare, for similar dates especially,

his teachers or his disciples—these blameless sectaries, in their retired valleys of Piedmont, clung Peter Waldo. with unconquerable fidelity to their purer, less imaginative faith. But whencesoever this humbler Biblical Christianity derived its origin, it received a powerful impulse from Peter Waldo. Waldo was a rich merchant of Lyons; his religious impressions, naturally strong, were quickened by one of those appalling incidents which often work so lastingly on the life of religious men. In a meeting for devotion a man fell dead, some say struck by lightning. From that time religion was the sole thought of Peter. He dedicated himself to poverty and the instruction of the people.<sup>a</sup> His lavish alms gathered the poor around him in grateful devotion. He was by no means learned, but he paid a poor scholar to translate the Gospels and some other books of Scripture.<sup>x</sup> Another grammarian rendered into his native tongue some selected sentences from the Fathers. Disciples gathered around him; he sent them, after the manner of the seventy, two by two, into the neighbouring villages to preach the Gospel. They called themselves the Humbled; others called them the Poor Men of Lyons.<sup>y</sup>

Two of Waldo's followers found their way to Rome.

---

Dante Paradiso, xi.; Gilly, Introduction, p. xxxviii.

This question is now set at rest by the discovery of the lost Waldensian MSS., presented by Morland to the University of Cambridge. It is clear that the date is 1400, not 1100. In one MS. there is an erasure; but the 4 can be traced with a glass. In another it is clearly “Ben ha mil e cccc ans.” See the paper by Mr. Bradshaw, librarian, to whom the discovery is due. Report of Cambridge Antiquarian Society, May 12, 1862.

There is a very curious extract on the voluntary poverty of the Church. I leave my former note unaltered. 1864.

<sup>a</sup> On Waldo, Reinerius Saccho, c. iv. v.; Alanus de Insulis; Stephan. de Borbone de VII. Don. Spirit. S.

<sup>x</sup> Chronicle of Laon, apud Bouquet, xiii.; Gilly, p. xciv.

<sup>y</sup> The name Insabatati is derived by Spanheim (*Hist. Christ. Sæc. xii.*) from their religious observance of the Sabbath, in opposition to the holidays of the Church. It is more probably from the word *sabot*, a wooden shoe.

They presented a book, written in the Gallo-Roman language; it contained a text and a gloss on the Psalter, and several books of the Old and New Testament. The Papal See was not so wise as afterwards, when Innocent III., having superciliously spurned the beggarly Francis of Assisi, was suddenly enlightened as to the danger of estranging, the advantage of attaching, such men to the service of the Church. The example of Waldo may have acted as a monition. The two were received in the Lateran Council by Alexander III. The Pope condescended to approve of their poverty, but they were condemned for presuming to interfere with the sacred functions of the priesthood.<sup>z</sup> When they implored permission to preach, they were either met by a hard refusal, with derision, or ungraciously required to obtain the consent of the jealous clergy. Their knowledge of Scripture seems to have perplexed John of Salisbury, who writes of them with the bitterness of a discomfited theologian.

As yet it is clear they contemplated no secession from the Church; they were not included under the condemnation of heretics in the Council, but they persisted in preaching without authority. They were interdicted by the Archbishop of Lyons. Waldo resolutely replied with that great axiom, so often misapplied, and for the right application of which the conscience must be enlightened with more than ordinary wisdom, "That he must obey God rather than man."

From that time the Poor Men of Lyons were involved in the common hatred which branded all opponents of the clergy with obloquy and contempt. They were

---

<sup>z</sup> The accounts of these proceedings at the Council of the Lateran appear to me to be thus reconcileable with no great difficulty. De Mapes, Chronic. Laon; Stephen Borbone; Moneta.

now comprehended among the heretics, condemned by Lucius III. at the Council of Verona.<sup>a</sup> Their hostility to the Church grew up with the hostility of the Church to them. They threw aside the whole hierarchical and ritual system, at least as far as the conviction of its value and efficacy, along with the priesthood. The sanctity of the priest was not in his priesthood, but in his life. The virtuous layman was a priest (they had aspired to reach that lofty doctrine of the Gospel), and could therefore administer with equal validity all the rites; even women, it is said, according to their view, might officiate. The prayers and offerings of a wicked priest were altogether of no avail.<sup>b</sup> Their doctrine was a full, minute, rigid protest against the wealth of the Church, the power of the Church.<sup>c</sup> The Church of Rome they denied to be the true Church: they inexorably condemned the homicidal engagements of popes and prelates in war. They rejected the seven Sacraments, except Baptism and the Eucharist. In baptism they denied all effect of the ablution by the sanctity of the water. A priest in

<sup>a</sup> Mansi, Concil. Veronens. 1184. Their preaching without licence was the avowed cause of their condemnation. "Catharos et Paterinos et eos, qui se humiliatos vel pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine mentiuntur, Passaginos, Josepinos, Arnaldistas, perpetuo decernimus anathemate sub jacere. Et quoniam nonnulli sub specie pietatis virtutem ejus, juxta quod ait apostolus, denegantes, auctoritatem sibi vindicant prædicandi: cum idem apostolus dicat, *quomodo prædicabunt nisi mittantur.* Rom. x. 15. Omnes qui vel prohibiti, vel non missi, præter autoritatem ab aposto-

lica sede vel episcopo loci susceptam, publicè vel privatim prædicare præsumperint, pari vinculo perpetui anathematis innodamus."

<sup>b</sup> Alani de Insulis, ii. 1.

<sup>c</sup> They seem to have anticipated a doctrine, afterwards widely adopted by the followers of the Abbot Joachim and the Fraticelli, that the Church was pure till the days of Sylvester. Its apostacy then began. "In eo (Silvestro) defecit quousque ipsi eam restaurarent. tamen dicunt quod semper fuerint aliqui, qui Deum tenebant et salvabantur."—See also Noble Leyczon, l. 403, Reinerii Summa. Martene. v. 1775.

mortal sin cannot consecrate the Eucharist. The transubstantiation takes place not in the hand of the priest, but in the soul of the believer. They rejected prayers for the dead, festivals, lights, purgatory, and indulgencies. The only approach towards Manicheism, and that is scarcely an approach, is that married persons must not come together but with the hope of having children. In no instance are the morals of Peter Waldo and the Alpine Biblicists arraigned by their worst enemies. There is a compulsory distinction, an enforced reverence, a speaking silence. They who denounce most copiously the immoralities, the incredible immorality of other sects in revolt against the hierarchy, acknowledge the modesty, frugality, honest industry, chastity, and temperance of the Poor Men of Lyons. Their language was simple and modest. They denied the legality of capital punishments.<sup>d</sup>

The great strength of the followers of Peter Waldo was no doubt their possession of the sacred Scriptures in their own language. They read the Gospels, they preached, and they prayed in the vulgar tongue.<sup>e</sup> They

<sup>d</sup> It is much to have extorted a milder damnation from Peter de Vaux Cernay. He derives the Waldenses from Waldo of Lyons. "They were bad, but much less perverse than other heretics." He describes them almost as a sort of Quakers. They wore sandals, like the apostles. They were on no account to swear, or to kill any one. They denied the necessity of episcopal ordination to consecrate the eucharist.—c. ii. apud Bouquet; or in Guizot, Collection des Mémoires.

<sup>e</sup> The third cause assigned by Reinerius Sacchio for their rapid progress

is "Veteris et Novi Testamenti in vulgarem linguam ab ipsis facta translationis quæ quidem edita est in urbe Metensi." They were strong in Metz. Alberic, Chronic. ad ann. 1200. But was the Romaunt version understood in Metz? There was more than one popular version.—See Preface by Le Roux de Lincy to the iv. Livres des Rois, Documents Inédits.—Compare the letter of Innocent III. (ii. 141) on this subject.

Two of the other causes assigned are the ignorance and irreverence of some of the clergy.

Dr. Gilly has rendered the valuable

rejected the mystical sense of the Scriptures. But besides the sacred Scriptures, they possessed other works in that Provençal dialect, in many parts of Southern France almost entirely devoted to amatory or to satiric songs. With them alone it spoke with deep religious fervour. The "Noble Lesson" is a remarkable work from its calm, almost unimpassioned simplicity; it is a brief, spirited statement of the Biblical history of man, with nothing of fanatic exaggeration, nothing even of rude vehemence; it is the perfect, clear morality of the Gospel. The close, which arraigns the clergy, has nothing of angry violence; it calmly expostulates against their persecutions, reproves the practice of death-bed absolution, and the composition for a life of wickedness by a gift to the priest. Its strongest sentence is an emphatic assertion that the power of absolving from mortal sin is in neither cardinal, bishop, abbot, pope, but in God alone.<sup>1</sup>

It is singular to find these teachers, whose whole theory was built on strict adherence to the letter of the Bible, mingled up with those whose vital principle was the rejection of the Old Testament and some part of the New. It might seem to require almost more than the fierce blindness of polemic hatred to confound them together. But it is not in the simplicity of the "Noble

service of printing the Romaunt version of the Gospel according to St. John. Dr. Gilly thinks that he has proved this version to be older, as quoted in it, than the Noble Leyczion. The quotations do not seem to me to be conclusive; they are like in many words, unlike in others. It is a very curious fact, if it will bear rigid critical investigation, that the Romaunt Version sometimes follows the old

Versio Itala (as printed by Sabatier) rather than the Vulgate.—Dr. Gilly's Preface.

<sup>1</sup> "Ma yo aus o dire, car se troba el ver,  
Que tuit li Papa, que foron de Silvestre  
entiro en aquest,  
E tuit li cardinal li vesque e tuit li aba,  
Tuit aqueste ensemp non han tan de po-  
testa  
Que ilh possan perdonar un sol pecca  
mortal;  
Solamente Dio perdona que autre non ha  
po far."—408-412.

—Raynouard, p. 97.

Lesson" alone, as contrasted with the whole system of traditional, legendary, mythic religion; the secret is in that last fatal sentence—the absolute denial of Papal, of priestly absolution.<sup>g</sup>

III. To these Anti-Sacerdotal tenets of the more Manichean speculative teachers, and the more practical heretics. antagonism of the disciples of Waldo, a widespread family of sects added doctrinal opinions, either strongly coloured by, or the actual revival and perpetuation of the ancient Eastern heresies. Nothing is more curious in Christian history than the vitality of the Manichean opinions. That wild, half poetic, half rationalistic theory of Christianity, with its mythic machinery and stern asceticism (like all asceticism liable to break forth into intolerable licence), which might seem congenial only to the Oriental mind; and if it had not expired, might be supposed only to linger beyond the limits of Christendom in the East, appears almost suddenly in the twelfth century, in living, almost irresistible power, first in its intermediate settlement in Bulgaria, and on the borders of the Greek Empire, then in Italy, in France, in Germany, in the remoter West, at the foot of the Pyrenees.<sup>h</sup>

<sup>g</sup> The doctrinal differences could not but be discerned. "Et illi quidem Valdenses contra alios (Arianos et Manicheos) acutissime disputabant." So writes one of their most ardent adversaries, the Abbot of Puy Laurens.—In prologo.

<sup>h</sup> On the Albigensian wars the chief authorities, besides the papal letters and documents, are the Chronicle of Peter de Vaux Cernay (I sometimes quote him in Latin from Bouquet, sometimes in French from Guizot,

Collection des Mémoires); the Abbot de Puy Laurens (*ibid.*); the Guerre des Albigeois; and the Gestes Glorieuses, in Guizot: and the very curious Romaunt poem, Guerre des Albigeois, published by Mons. Fauriel (*Documents Historiques*). I cite him as the Troubadour. The Troubadour attributes his song (*canson, chanson*) to Master William of Tudela, a very learned man, greatly admired by clerks and laymen, endowed with the gift of geomancy, by which he predicted the

The tradition of Western Manicheism breaks off about the sixth century; if it subsisted, it was in such obscurity as to escape even the jealous vigilance of the Church.<sup>i</sup> But in the East its descent is marked by the rise of a new, powerful, and enduring sect, the Paulicians. The history of Latin Christianity may content itself with but a brief and rapid summary of the settlements, migrations, conquests, calamities of the Paulicians; till they pass the frontier of the Greek Empire, and invade in the very centre the dominions of the Latin Church.<sup>k</sup> Their name implies that with the broader principles of Manicheism, they combined some peculiar reverence for the doctrine, writings, and person of St. Paul. In an Eastern mind it is not difficult to suppose a fusion between the impersonated, deified, and oppugnant powers of good and evil, and St. Paul's high moral antagonism of sin and grace in the soul of man, the inborn and hereditary evil and the infused and imparted righteousness. The war within the man is but a perpetuation of the eternal war throughout the worlds.

destruction of the land. This personage was at first, erroneously as M. Fauriel shows, supposed to have been the poet. The poet says that he wrote it at Montauban, and denounces the niggardly nobles, who had neither given him vest nor mantle of silk, nor Breton palfrey to amble through the land. "But as they will not give a button, I will not ask them for a coal from their hearth. . . . The Lord God, who made the sky and the air, confound them, and his holy mother Mary." —p. 17. On the change in the Troubadour's politics, see forward. The *Histoire de Languedoc*, by Dom. Vaissette is an invaluable and honourably impartial work.

<sup>i</sup> Mr. Maitland has been unable to discover any notice of Manicheism in Europe for more than 400 years; from the sixth century to the burning of the Canons at Orleans in 1017 or 1022. Gieseler has one or two very doubtful references. I doubt, with Mr. Maitland, the Manicheism of these Canons.—*Facts and Documents*, p. 405. The account of the Canons is in Adhemar apud Bouquet, x. 35, and Rodulf Glaber. Those of Arras (*Acta Synod. Atrab. apud Mansi*, sub ann. 1025) are far more suspicious.

<sup>k</sup> The history of the Paulicians has been drawn with such vigour, rapidity, fulness, and exactness by Gibbon, that I feel glad of this excuse.—c. liv.

The Paulicians burst suddenly into being, in the neighbourhood of Samosata. Their first apostle, Constantine, is said to have wrought his simpler system out of the New Testament, accidentally bestowed upon him, especially from the writings of St. Paul. His disciples rejected alike the vast fabric of traditional belief, which in the Greek and Latin Churches had grown up around the Gospel; and the cumbrous and fantastical mythology of the older Manicheism.<sup>m</sup> The Paulicians spread over all the adjacent regions, Asia Minor, Pontus, to the borders of Armenia and the shores of the Euphrates. Persecution gave them martyrs, the first of these was their primitive teacher. The blood of martyrs, as with Christianity itself, seemed but to multiply their numbers and strength. They bore, during many successive reigns, in Christian patience the intolerant wrath of Justinian II., of Nicephorus, of

Michael I., of Theodora. Their numbers may

<sup>A.D. 842.</sup> be estimated by the report that during the short reign of that Empress perished 100,000 victims. Persecution at length from a sect condensed them into a tribe of rebels. They rose in revolt. Their city Tephrice, near Trebisond, became the capital of an independent people. They leagued with the Mohammedans: they wasted Asia Minor. Constantine Copronymus, with their own consent, transported a great body of Paulicians into Thrace, as an outpost to the Byzantine Empire. John Zimisces conducted another great migration to the valleys of Mount Hæmus. From their Bulgarian settlements (they had mingled apparently to a considerable extent with the Bulgarians), the Crusades,

---

<sup>m</sup> The Paulicians disclaimed Manes. Προθύμως ἀναθεματίζουσι Σκυθιανδρούς τε καὶ Μαγέντα.—Petr. Sicul. p. 42.

the commerce which arose out of the Crusades, opened their way into Western Europe. Manicheism, under this form, is found in almost every great city of Italy. The name of Bulgarian (in its coarsest form) is one of the appellations of hatred, which clings to them in all quarters. At the accession of Innocent III. Manicheism is almost undisputed master of Southern France.<sup>n</sup>

Western Manicheism, however, though it adhered only to the broader principles of Orientalism, <sup>Western</sup> <sup>Manicheism.</sup> the two co-equal conflicting principles of good and evil, the eternity of matter and its implacable hostility to spirit, aversion to the Old Testament as the work of the wicked Demiurge, the unreality of the suffering Christ, was or became more Manichean than its Grecian parent Paulicianism. The test which distinguishes the Manichean from the other Anti-Sacerdotalists is the assertion, more or less obscure, of those Eastern doctrines; the more visible signs, asceticism; the proscription, or hard and reluctant concession of marriage, or of any connexion between the sexes; and the strong distinction between the Perfect and the common disciples. They were called in disdain the Puritans (Cathari), an appellation which perhaps they did not disdain; and it is singular that the opprobrious term applied by the married clergy to the Monastics (Paterines) is now the common designation of the Manichean haters of marriage. Western Manicheism is but dimly to be detected in the eleventh century. The

<sup>n</sup> Some of the Catholic writers assert distinctly their Greek descent. “Illi vero qui combusti sunt [those at Cologne] dixerunt nobis in defensione sua hanc haeresin usque ad haec tempora occultatam fuisse a tempor-

bus martyrum in Graeciâ, et quibusdam aliis terris.” See also Reiner apud Martene, Thes. v. 1767, who mentions the “Bulgarian community.” Muratcri, Antiq. Ital. v. 83.

Canons of Orleans were, if their accusers speak true, profligates rather than sectarians. Those burned by Heribert, Archbishop of Milan, were accused of two strangely discordant delinquencies, both irreconcileable with Manicheism—Judaism and Paganism. These heretics held the castle of Montforte, in the diocese of Asti. They were questioned: they declared themselves prepared to endure any sufferings. They honoured virginity, lived in chastity even with their wives: never touched meat, fasted, and so distributed their prayers that in no hour of the day were orisons not offered to the Lord. They had their goods in common. They believed in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; *in the power of binding and loosing; in the Old and New Testament.* Their castle stood a siege. It was taken at length by the resistless arms of the Archbishop. All endeavours were made to convert the obstinate sectarians. At length in the market-place were raised, here a cross, there a blazing pyre. They were brought forth, commanded to throw themselves before the cross, confess their sins, accept the Catholic faith, or to plunge into the flames; a few knelt before the cross; the greater number covered their faces, rushed into the fire and were consumed.<sup>o</sup>

But in the twelfth century Manicheism is rampant, bold, undisguised. Everywhere are Puritans, Paterines, ropulars, suspected or convicted or confessed Manicheans. The desperate Church is compelled to resort to the irrefragable argument of the sword and the stake.

<sup>o</sup> Sub ann. 1031. Landulph. Sen. ii. c. 27, apud Muratori, R. It. S. iv. If the human race, said one, would abstain from fleshly connection, men would breed like bees, without con-

junction. Did they know that they were quoting an ancient orthodox Father? They said they had a Supreme Pontiff—not the Bishop of Rome—probably, the Holy Spirit.

Woe to the prince or to the magistrate who refused to be the executioner of the stern law. During the last century, Wazon, Bishop of Liège, had lifted up his voice, his solitary voice, against this unchristian means of conversion;<sup>p</sup> no such sound is now heard; if uttered, it is overborne by the imperious concord of prelates in Council, by the authoritative voice of the Pope. The Crusade begins its home mission. In Cologne,<sup>Cologne.</sup> the ready populace throw the heretics into the flames.<sup>q</sup> The clergy, the Archbishop of Nicæa, desired a more deliberate and solemn judgement. The calmness of the heretics in the fire amazed, almost appalled, their judges.

The chief seat of these opinions was the South of France. Innocent III., on his accession, found not only those daring insurgents scattered in the cities of Italy, even, as it were, at his own gates (among his first acts was to subdue the Paterines of Languedoc. Viterbo), he found a whole province, a realm, in some respects the richest and noblest of his spiritual domain, absolutely dissevered from his Empire, in almost universal revolt from Latin Christianity. This beautiful region, before the fatal crusade against the Albigensians, had advanced far more rapidly towards civilisation than any other part of Europe; but this civilisation was entirely independent of or rather hostile to ecclesiastical influence. Languedoc (as also Provence), the land of

<sup>p</sup> *Gesta Episcop. Leodens.* c. 59. Gieseler, note, p. 413.

<sup>q</sup> 1146. *Evervini Epist. ad Bernard.* in Mabillon. With these, though in their condemnation of marriage (which they did not explain), and in their organization (the Perfect

and the hearers) Manichean, the dominant tenets were simply Anti-Sacerdotalist. Some said human souls were apostate spirits imprisoned in the flesh.—Ekberti, *Sermon xiii.* in *Biblioth. P. P. Lugdun.*

that melodious tongue first attuned to modern poetry, was one of the great fiefs of the realm of France, but a fief which paid only remote and doubtful fealty; it was almost an independent kingdom. The Count of Toulouse<sup>2</sup> was suzerain of five great subordinate fiefs. I. Narbonne, whose Count possessed the most ample feudal privileges. II. Beziers, under which Viscount held the Counts of Albi and Carcassonne. III. The Countship of Foix, with six territorial vassalages. IV. The Countship of Montpellier, now devolved on Pedro, King of Arragon. V. The Countship of Quercy and Rhodez. The courts of these petty sovereigns vied with each other in splendour and gallantry. Life was a perpetual tournament or feast. The Count of Toulouse and his vassals had been amongst the most distinguished of the Crusaders; they had brought home many usages of Oriental luxury. Their intercourse with the polished Mussulman Courts of Spain, if war was not actually raging, or even when it was, had become courteous, almost friendly. Their religion was chivalry, but chivalry becoming less and less religious; the mistress had become the saint, the casuistry of the Court of Love superseded that of the confessional. There had grown up a gay licence of manners, not adverse only to the austerity of monkish Christianity, but to pure Christian morals.

The cities had risen in opulence and splendour. Many of them had preserved their Roman municipal institutions: their Consuls held the supreme power in defiance of temporal and spiritual lords. In the cities the Jews were numerous and wealthy; against them the religious prejudices had worn away and mitigated into social

---

<sup>2</sup> Capefigue, Philippe Auguste, iii. 1.

intercourse. Literature, at least poetry, had begun to speak to the prince and to the people. But if the Romaunt among the peasants of the Alpine valleys confined itself to grave and holy lessons, in Languedoc it was the amatory or satiric song of the Troubadour. Notwithstanding the lofty homage of Dante,<sup>s</sup> the exquisite flattery of Petrarch's emulation, it may be doubted whether the Provençal poetry so prematurely refined, subtle, and effeminate, would, if uncrushed with the rest of the Provençal civilisation by the revengeful Church, ever have risen to an honourable height. The Troubadour (though he might occasionally urge the pious glory of adventure in the Holy Land) was in general content with being the Poet Laureate of the Courts of Love. The war hymn seemed to have expired on the lips of the fierce Bertrand de Born. It has ceased to be passionate, is become ingenious; it is over-refined in word and thought, often coarse in matter. But this was the song and the music in the castle hall, at the perpetual banquet. The chant in the castle chapel was silent, or unheard. The priest was either pining in neglect, or listening, as gay as the rest, to the lively troubadour.<sup>t</sup> Nor was the Troubadour without his welcome song in the city; it

\* See on Arnold Daniel, *Dante Purgatorio*, xxvi. 118. Petrarch, *Triunfo d'Amore*, Petrarch's general imitation of the Provençal poets. Whoever will read the *Florilegium* in the second volume of M. Raynouard will hardly deny the Provençal poets the praise of grace and delicacy. The Epic on the war of the Albigenses, infinitely curious as history, as poetry is stone dead; Girart de Rousillon appears not very

hopeful; if Ferabras be indeed Provençal, not northern, "that strain is of a higher mood." See the very interesting notices by the late M. Fauriel in his new volume (the 22nd) of the *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, pp. 167, *et seqq.*, and on Bertrand de Born, the friend and rival poet of Richard Cœur de Lion. Also Diez, *Troubadours*, p. 179.

<sup>t</sup> Raynouard.

was there the bitter satire on the clergy, the invective against the vices, the venality of Rome, against the pilgrimage to Rome, against the morose bishop, if such bishop there were, or against the Legate himself.

In no European country had the clergy so entirely, <sup>Low state  
of the  
clergy.</sup> or it should seem so deservedly forfeited its authority. In none had the Church more absolutely ceased to perform its proper functions. If heresy was the cause of the degradation of the Church, the self-degradation of the Church had given its strength to heresy; the profession which was the object of ambition, of awe if not of reverence, of hatred if not of love, in other parts of Christendom, had here fallen into contempt. Instead of the old proverb for the lowest abasement, "I had rather my son were a Jew," the Provençals said, "I had rather he were a priest."<sup>a</sup>

The knights rarely allowed their sons to enter into orders, but, to secure the tithes to themselves, presented the sons of low-born vassals to the churches, whom the bishops were obliged to ordain for want of others. The heretics had public burial-grounds of their own, and received larger legacies than the Church. This was not the work of Peter de Brueys, or of Henry the Deacon. That work must have been half done for the heresiarchs by the wealthy, indolent, luxurious clergy. Men, in a religious age, will have religion; and it can hardly be supposed that the Provençal mind had generally outgrown the ancient ritualistic faith, if that faith had been administered with dignity, with gentleness, with decency.

St. Bernard's conquest had passed away with his pre-

---

<sup>a</sup> William de Puy Laurens. I quote either the Latin from Boquet, or the French from Guizot's Collection des Mémoires.

sence. Not many years after, a council at Lomberes<sup>\*</sup> (near Albi) arraigns a number of persons of Manichean opinions, rejection of the Old Testament, erroneous tenets on baptism and the Eucharist, repudiation of marriage. They extort an unwilling, seemingly an insincere assent to the orthodox creed. Thirteen years after, the Count of Toulouse himself (Raymond V.) raises a cry of distress. Five distinguished prelates, with the sanction of the Kings of England and of France, the Cardinal Peter Chrysogonus at their head, find the whole country almost in possession of the heretics.<sup>†</sup>

A.D. 1165.

A.D. 1178.

So basked the pleasant land in its sunshine; voluptuousness and chivalrous prodigality in its castles,<sup>‡</sup> luxury and ease in its cities: the thunder-cloud was far off in the horizon. The devout found their religious excitement in the new and forbidden opinions. There was for the more hard and zealous an asceticism which put to shame the feeble monkery of those days; for the more

\* Acta in Mansi, sub ann. Compare for all this period Vaissette, Hist. de Languedoc, iii. in init.

† "This heresy, which the Lord curse (says the devout Troubadour), had in its power the whole Albigeois, Carcassonne, and Lauragais, from Beziers, to Bordeaux."—Fauriel, p. 5; Vaissette, sub ann. "Churches were in ruins, baptism refused, the eucharist in execration, penance despised. Sacrements anéantis—on introduisit les deux principes."—p. 47. Raymond V. died in 1194. He had burned many heretics.

‡ "Dans la fameuse fête de Beaucaire, où se réunirent une multitude de chevaliers des pays Provençaux,

d'Aquitaine, d'Aragon, et de Catalogne, les princes Provençaux semblaient vouloir rivaliser de faste extravagant avec les despotes Asiatiques; le comte de Toulouse gratifia de cent mille sous d'argent le Seigneur Raymond d'Argent, qui les distribua entre tous les chevaliers présents. Bertrand Raimbaud, Comte d'Orange, fit labourer tous les environs du château et y fit semer jusqu'à trente mille sous en deniers. Raymond de Venous fit brûler, par ostentation, trente de ses plus beaux chevaux devant l'assemblée."—Hist. de Languedoc, iii. 37. "Le Midi délivrait à la veille de sa ruine."—Michelet, and also H. Martin, Histoire de France, iv. p. 189.

simply pious, the biblical doctrines; and what seems to have been held in the deepest reverence, the Consolation in death, which, administered by the Perfect alone (men of tried and known holiness), had all the blessing, none of the doubtful value of absolution bestowed by the carnal, wicked, worldly, as well as by the most sanctified, priest.

Innocent had hardly ascended the Pontifical throne, <sup>Apr. 20, 1198.</sup> when he wrote, first, a strong letter to the First mea-sures of Pope Innocent. Archbishop of Auch; in a few months after, a mandate, addressed to all the great prelates in the south of France; the Archbishops of Aix, Narbonne, Auch, Vienne, Arles, Embrun, Tarragona, Lyons, with their suffragans: to all the princes, barons, counts, and all Christian people. This Papal Manifesto broadly asserted the civil as well as religious outlawry of all heretics;<sup>a</sup> the right to banish them, to confiscate their property, to coerce, or to put them to death. The temporal sovereigns were, at the summons of the two Legates, Rainer and Guy (Cistercian monks), to carry these penalties submissively into effect,<sup>b</sup> they were offered the strong worldly temptation of all the confiscated estates, and indulgences the same as they would have obtained by visiting the churches of St. Peter or St. James of Compostella.

<sup>a</sup> Innocent names as the obnoxious heretics the Valdenses, the Cathari, and the Paterini. He acknowledges their works of love; but with the charity of a churchman of that age, ascribes these to dissembling artifice, in order to obtain proselytes. "Justitiae vultum prætendunt, et studentes simulatis operibus caritatis, eos amplius circumveniunt, quos ad reli-

gionis propositum viderint ardentius aspirare."—Apud Baluz., i. 94.

<sup>b</sup> "Postquam per prædictum fratre Rainerum fuerint excommunicationis sententiâ innodati, eorum bona confiscent, et de terra sua proscriptant." The further "animadversion" is indicated by a significant allusion to the stoning of Achan, the son of Carmi.

But these first measures only aggravated the evil. The mission of these Cistercian brethren as Papal Legates, and that of the Cardinal John, were alike without effect.<sup>c</sup> To the honour of the Sovereigns of the great fiefs they were not moved by the temporal or spiritual boons. Nor could this refusal of the nobles to perform the rigorous behest of the Pope be attributed altogether to humanity. Their wives and families, if not themselves, were deeply implicated in the religious insurrection. In one assembly, held in the year 1204,<sup>d</sup> five of the most distinguished ladies of Provence, among them Esclarmonde, widow of Jordan Lord of Lisle Jourdain, and sister of the Count of Foix,<sup>e</sup> were admitted into the heretical community. At the public reception of these ladies by one of the Perfect, they gave themselves up to God and his Gospel, promised for the future to eat neither meat, eggs, nor cheese, to allow themselves only vegetables and fish. They pledged themselves further neither to swear nor to lie, to abstain from all carnal intercourse, and to be faithful to the sect even unto death.

New powers were demanded; sterner and more active agents required to combat the deepening danger. The Pope looked still to the monastic orders, to the spiritual descendants of St. Bernard. Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, of that Order, were now charged with the desperate enterprise. These first Inquisitors were invested with extraordinary powers; to them was transferred the whole episcopal authority;

<sup>c</sup> "Mais (Dieu me bénisse ! je ne puis autrement dire) si non que les hérétiques ne font pas plus de cas de sermons que d'une pomme gâtée."—Fauriel, p. 7. This preaching lasted five years.

<sup>d</sup> Vaissette, Hist. de Languedoc, iii. p. 133. Preuves, p. 437. <sup>e</sup> The other sister and the wife of the Count of Foix were Waldensians.—Petr. V. C. vi. 10.

Cistercian  
brethren,  
1200.

the ordinary jurisdiction was superseded at their will ; the Archbishop of Narbonne accuses them of extending the powers with which they were endowed for the suppression of heresy, to punish the excesses even of the clergy.<sup>f</sup> They retorted by laying informations in Rome against the Archbishop ; they deposed the Bishop of Viviers ; suspended the Bishop of Beziers ; he had refused to excommunicate the consuls of his city infected with heresy. The Legates assembled the bailiffs, the

<sup>A.D. 1203.</sup> Count of Toulouse, and the Consuls of the city, and extorted an oath to expel the "good men" from the land. The oath had no effect ; Toulouse, the deceitful,<sup>g</sup> went on in its calm tolerance. To these Papal Legates, to Peter of Castelnau, and to Raoul, was associated Arnold d'Amouri, the Abbot of Citeaux, the Abbot of Abbots, a man whose heart was sheathed with the triple iron of pride, cruelty, bigotry. The sermons of Arnold were met with derision.<sup>h</sup> The Papal Legates travelled through the land from city to city, in the utmost hierarchical pomp, with their retinue in rich attire, and a vast cavalcade of horses and sumpter mules. It was on their second circuit that they encountered, near Montpellier (in Montpellier alone the King of Arragon had attempted to enforce the expulsion of the heretics), the Spanish Bishop of Osma, on his way to the north, with (the future saint) Dominic. The

<sup>f</sup> "Deinde cum pro hæreticis expellendis solummodo legatio prima vobis injuncta fuisset, vos ad ampliandam vestræ legationis potestatem, clericorum excessus hæresim esse interpretantes, multa contra formam mandati, et in detrimentum ecclesie Narbonensis egistis."—Epist. ad Innocent. III. apud Vaissette, *Preuves*, May 29, 1204.

<sup>g</sup> "Tolosa, tota dolosa."—Petr. de V. C.

<sup>h</sup> Of Arnold writes the Troubadour : "Ce saint homme s'en alla avec les autres par la terre des hérétiques, leur prêchant de se convertir, mais plus il les priait, plus ils se raillaient de lui et le tenaient pour sot."—p. 7.

dejected Legates bitterly mourned their want of success. "How expect success with this secular pomp?" replied the severer Spaniards. "Sow the good seed as the heretics sow the bad. Cast off those sumptuous robes, renounce those richly-caparisoned palfreys, go barefoot, without purse and scrip, like the Apostles; out-labour, out-fast, out-discipline these false teachers." The Spaniards were not content with these stern admonitions; the Bishop of Osma and his faithful Dominic sent back their own horses, stripped themselves to the rudest monkish dress, and led the way on the spiritual campaign. The Legates were constrained to follow. Yet, notwithstanding their boasted triumphs in all the conferences, which were held at Verfeil, Caraman, Beziers, at Carcassonne, Montreal, Pamiers; notwithstanding their wise compliance with the counsel of Dominic, notwithstanding the exertions of that eloquent and indefatigable man and the preachers whom he had already begun to organise, their barefoot pilgrimage, their emulous or surpassing austerities, Heresy bowed not its head; it was deaf to the voice of the charmer. The temporal power must be commanded to do the work which the spiritual cannot do. Already the Legates had wrung the unwilling sentence of expulsion of the heretics from the municipal authorities of Toulouse. Yet it was a concession of fear, not of persuasion. The assemblies were still held, if with less ostentation, hardly with disguise.<sup>i</sup>

<sup>i</sup> "Tandem illæ duæ olive! illa  
duo candelabra lucentia ante Dominum  
servis servilem incutientes timorem,  
minantes eis rerum dilapidationem,  
regum ac principum designationem  
intimantes, hæresium objurationem,

hæreticorum expulsionem eis persuaserunt; sicque ipsi non virtutis amore  
sed, secundum poetas 'cessabant pec-  
care mali formidine poenæ,' quod ma-  
nifestis maliciis demonstrarunt. Nam  
statim perjuri effecti, et miseris sum-

Toulouse must have a Bishop at least of energetic character. In the time of Bishop Fontevraud the episcopal authority had sunk so low that he could not exact even his lawful revenues, and when he went on his visitation he was obliged to demand a guard from the Count for his personal safety. He was succeeded by Raymond de Rabenstein, who passed the three years of his episcopate, which he had gained by simony, in war with one of his vassals, by which he had so utterly ruined his finances, that he submitted quietly to be deposed at the will of the Pope. His successor, Fulk of Marseilles,<sup>k</sup> was of a different, even less Christian character. There is no act of treachery or cruelty throughout the war in which the Bishop of Toulouse was not the most forward, sanguinary, unscrupulous. Fulk in his youth had been a gay Troubadour. The son of a rich Genoese, settled at Marseilles, he despised trade, wandered about to the courts of the more accomplished princes of the day, Richard of England, Alphonso of Arragon, and the elder Raymond of Toulouse. Fulk delighted the nobles with his amorous songs (still to be read in their unchastened warmth) and aspired

recidivum patientes, in conventiculis suis, ipso noctis medio, prædicantes hæreticos occultabant."—Petr. V. C. apud Bouquet. See also Gul. de Pod. Laurent., apud Bouquet, and Vit. S. Dominic. apud Bolland.

<sup>k</sup> The songs of Fulk of Marseilles may be found in Raynouard, vol. ii. See also Fauriel, Hist. de la Poésie Provençale, vol. ii. Life of Fulk, Hist. Littéraire de la France, xviii. p. 586, &c. "Après avoir donné la moitié de sa vie à la galanterie, il livra sans retenue l'autre moitié à la

cause de tyrannie, du meurtre et de spoliation, et malheureusement il en profita." He had a remarkable talent for poetry:—"Amant passionné des dames, apôtre fougueux de l'Inquisition, il ne cessa de composer des vers qui portèrent l'empreinte de ses passions successives." Compare his verses to the Lady of Marseilles and his Hymn to the Virgin. He was at the court of Cœur de Lion at Poitiers; of Raymond V.; of Alphonso II. of Arragon; of Alphonso IX., king of Castile. Dante places him in Paradise.

to the favour of high-born ladies. The wife and both the sisters of Barral, Viscount of Marseilles, were the objects of his lyric adoration. Repulsed by Viscountess Adelheid, he was seized with a poetic passion for Eudoxia, wife of William of Montpellier. On the death of this prince, by which he was greatly shocked, he threw himself into a cloister; the passion of devotion succeeded to worldly passions. The monastic discipline scourged all tenderness out of his heart, and by unchristian cruelty to himself, he trained himself to far more unchristian cruelty towards others.

Eight years had now passed of ineffective preaching, menace, fulmination. The Sovereign of the land must be summoned to be the Lictor of the Papal Mandate, the executioner on his own subjects of the awful sentence of blood, by shedding which, with hypocrisy which only aggravates cruelty, the Church held itself sullied; such sentence here, indeed, it wanted the power to accomplish without the civil aid.

Raymond VI. Count of Toulouse is darkly coloured by the hatred of the sterner among the writers of the Church of Rome as a concealed heretic, <sup>Count Raymond of Toulouse.</sup> as a fautor of heretics, as a man of deep dissimulation and consummate treachery. He appears to have been a gay, voluptuous, generous man, without strength of character enough to be either heretic or bigot. Loose in his life, he had had five wives, three living at the same time, the sister of the Viscount of Beziers, the daughter of the King of Cyprus, the sister of Richard of England; on the death of the last he married the sister of King Pedro of Arragon. The two latter were his kindred within the prohibited degrees. This man was no Manichean! Yet Raymond, even though his wives were thus uncanonically wed, is subject to no

high moral reproof from the Pope; it is only as refusing to execute the Papal commands against his subjects (towards him at least unoffending), that he is the victim of excommunication, is despoiled of realm, of honour, of salvation.<sup>1</sup>

Raymond had succeeded to the sovereignty four years<sup>m</sup> before the accession of Innocent III. The first event of his reign was his excommunication for usurpation (as it was called) on the rights of the clergy of St.

Gilles. This excommunication it was one of

A.D. 1128.

Innocent's first acts to remove. The position of the Count of Toulouse and of his nobles had been strange and trying for the most courageous and wisest of men. They knew that they could not persuade, they could hardly hope to defend, they were called upon to persecute their subjects, their peaceful, perhaps attached subjects, for a crime of which at least they did not feel the atrocity. They were commanded to be the obesant executioners of punishments not awarded by themselves, of which they did not admit the justice, of which they could not but see the inhumanity. They were summoned by the Church, which was itself, by its negligence, its dissoluteness, its long-continued worldliness,

<sup>1</sup> Compare on Raymond Petr. V. C. c. iv. The Abbot had heard from a Bishop a speech of Raymond's: "Quod monachi Cistercienses non poterant salvare, quia tenebant oves, quæ luxuriam exercebant. O hæresis inaudita!" All his stories he relates on the authority of the Abbot Arnold, Raymond's deadly enemy. Many irreverent speeches were attributed to him, some implying heresy. "I see the devil made this world; nothing turns out as I wish." Playing at

chess with his chaplain, he said, "The God of Moses, in whom you believe, will not help you." The following are still more improbable. He said of a heretic of Castres, who had been mutilated, and dragged out a miserable life, "I had rather be he than king or emperor." "I know that I shall lose my realm for the 'good men.' I will bear the loss of my realm, even of my life, in their cause."

<sup>m</sup> A.D. 1194. Vaissette, p. 101.

its want of Christianity, at least a main cause of the evil.<sup>a</sup> They were peremptorily ordered to desolate their country ; to expel, or worse, to pursue to death a large part, and that the most industrious, most prosperous of their subjects ; thus to repay the obedience and love of those among whom they had been born and had lived, who had followed their banner, rendered loyal allegiance to their lawful demands. They were to leave their towns in ruins, their fields uncultivated, or to people their land with strangers ; to incur the odious suspicion of aiding the Church in order to profit by the plunder of their vassals, to enrich themselves out of confiscations ; and all these hard measures were to be taken perhaps against the friends of youth, against kindred, against men whose blameless lives won respect and admiration.<sup>b</sup>

Peter de Castelnau, the Legate, determined at length on extreme proceedings ; the times, he thought, gave him an auspicious occasion. Private wars had broken out, in which Count Raymond and some of the other nobles were engaged. In these wars the property of the Church was not religiously respected ; in the sieges of towns their fields and vineyards suffered waste ; some of the nobles at war with Raymond alleged as their excuse the hostilities in which they were involved. The Legates peremptorily called on all the belligerent parties to make peace, in order to combine

Peter de  
Castelnau.

<sup>a</sup> “Cujus rei culpa forte pro magna parte refundi poterat in prælatos, ut pote qui saltem latrare potuerant, reprehendere et mordere.” Such is the ingenuous confession of a writer on the side of the Church.—Gul. de Pod. Laur. apud Bouquet, xix. p. 199.

<sup>b</sup> Compare the pathetic sentence in the same author : “Quare ergo de terra, dixit episcopus, eos non expellitis et fugatis ? At ait ille, non possumus ; sumus enim nutriti cum eis, et habemus de nostris consanguineis apud ipsos, et eos honeste vivere contemplamur.”—Ibid., p. 200.

their forces against those worse enemies the heretics. Raymond did not at once obey this imperious dictation. Peter of Castelnau uttered the sentence of excommunication, and placed his whole territory under an interdict. Instead of repressing this bold assumption of power on the part of his Legate, Innocent addressed a letter to Raymond, perhaps unexampled in the furious vehemence of its language. It had no superscription, for it was to a man under sentence of excommunication. No epithet of scorn was spared :—“ If with the Prophet (it began) I could break through the wall of thy heart, I would show thee all its abominations.” It threatened him with the immediate vengeance of God, with every temporal calamity, with everlasting fire. “ Who art thou, that when the illustrious King of Arragon and the other nobles, at the exhortation of our Legates, have consented to terms of peace, alone looking for advantage in war, like a carrion bird preying on carcases, refusest all treaties ? ” It charged him with violating his repeated oaths to prosecute all heretics in his dominions, with rejecting the appeal of the Archbishop of Arles in the course of war to spare all monasteries, and to abstain from arms on Sundays and holidays.<sup>1</sup> “ Impious, cruel, and direful tyrant, thou art so far gone in heretical pravity, that when reproved for thy defence of heretics, thou saidest that thou wouldest find a bishop of the heretics who would prove his faith to be better than that of the Catholics.” It charged him with bestowing offices of trust and honour on Jews; with seizing and fortifying churches. Innocent ended with the menace of depriving him of his territory, which he declared that

---

<sup>1</sup> It might be inquired whether these provisions were afterwards enforced on the Crusaders.

he held of the Church of Rome;<sup>a</sup> of arraying all the neighbouring princes against him as an enemy of Christ, and a persecutor of the Church; and of offering his realm as a prize to the conqueror who might subdue it, in order that it might escape the disgrace of being ruled by a heretic.<sup>r</sup>

The denunciation of the victim was immediately followed by the summons to the executioner. A Papal letter was addressed to the King, to all the counts, barons, nobles, and to all faithful Christians in France; to the Counts of Vermandois and Blois, the Count of Bar, the Duke of Burgundy, the Count of Nevers, commanding them to take up arms for the suppression of the heretics in the South of France. Their own territories in the mean time were placed under the protection of St. Peter and the Pope; all who dared to violate them were exposed to ecclesiastical censure.<sup>s</sup> All the estates and the goods of the heretics were to be confiscated and divided among those who should engage in this holy enterprise, and the same indulgences granted as for a Crusade in the Holy Land, so soon as war should be declared against Raymond of Toulouse, the disobedient vassal of the Church, the protector and abettor of heretics.

In the mean time Peter of Castelnau was not inactive; he secretly stirred up the Lords of Languedoc against Raymond. Raymond made peace, and thereby

<sup>a</sup> "Terram quam noscias ab Ecclesiâ Romanâ tenere, tibi faciemus auferri."

<sup>r</sup> "Telle est cette lettre fulminante du Pape Innocent III. à Raymond VI., Comte de Toulouse, dont le principal motif est le refus que ce Prince avait fait de conclure la paix avec ses vassaux

du Marquisat de Provence, avec lesquels il étoit en guerre, afin de joindre ses armes aux leurs pour exterminer les hérétiques."—Vaissette, iii. 151. Innocent. Epist. x. 61. May 28, 1207.

<sup>s</sup> Epist. x. 149.

fondly supposed himself delivered from the excommunication. But the inexorable Peter stood before him, reproached him to his face with cowardice, accused him of perjury, and of abetting heresy. He renewed the excommunication in all its plenitude.

Conceive at this instant, a Pontiff like Innocent, with <sup>Murder of Peter de Castelnau.</sup> all his lofty notions of the sanctity, the inviolability of every ecclesiastic, confirmed by the consciousness of his yet irresistible power, receiving the intelligence of the barbarous murder of his Legate; another Becket fallen before a meaner sovereign; the sacred person of his Legate transfixed by the lance of an assassin.<sup>t</sup> That the terror and hatred of the clergy in Languedoc should instantly and obstinately ascribe the crime to Raymond himself, that Innocent in his eager indignation should adopt their version of the death of Peter, excites no wonder. Their report, publicly countenanced by the Pope, was this: that the Legates had been invited to a conference at St. Gilles, that the Count had sternly refused to ratify the satisfaction which he had promised, that he had uttered dark menaces against the Legates. The Legates had passed the night under an armed guard on the shores of the Rhône; in the morning, when they were crossing the river, Peter of Castelnau was transfixed with a lance by

<sup>Jan. 15, 1208.</sup> one of the emissaries of Count Raymond. He only lived long enough to breathe out,

“God pardon them, as I pardon them.”<sup>u</sup> Raymond

\* “Quand le Pape sut, quand lui fut dite la nouvelle, que son légat avait été tué, sachez qu'elle lui fut dure; de la colère qu'il en eût, il se tint la machoire, et se mit à prier Saint Jacques, celui de Compostella, et Saint Pierre, qui est enseveli dans la Chapelle de Rome. Quand il eut fait son oraison, il éteignit le cierge, 15 Jan. 1208.”—Apud Fauriel, p. 9.

<sup>u</sup> Innocent. Epist. xi. 26. The Troubadour says, “Un des écuyers

was afterwards charged with having admitted the assassin into his intimate intercourse.

Strong contemporary evidence, as well as all the probabilities of the case, absolutely acquit the Count of Toulouse of any concern in this crime. It may have been done by some rash partisan who thought that he was fulfilling his master's wishes; but one writer states that Raymond was never known to be so moved to anger as by this event. He was not of that passionate temperament which might be hurried into such a deed. He could not but see at once its danger, its impolicy, and its uselessness. The enemy of Raymond was not the individual monk, but the whole hierarchy, and the Pope himself; and he must have known too that of his own partisans all the superstitious, all the timid, all the religious would be estranged by an awful crime perpetrated on the sacred person of a legate of the Pope.\*

The dying prayer of the Legate may have been accepted in heaven; on earth it received barren admiration, but touched no heart with mercy.

Innocent at once assumed the guilt of Raymond. He proclaimed it in letters to the Archbishops of Narbonne, Arles, Embrun, Aix, Vienne, and their suffragans; to the Archbishop of Lyons and his suffragans. Every Sunday and every holy

(du Comte) qui en avait grande rancune, et voulait se rendre désormais agréable à son Seigneur, tua le Légat en trahison." "He fled to Beaucaire, where his relations lived."—p. 9.

\* Raymond, according to the Hist. des Albigeois, would have punished the assassin (he had fled to Beaucaire), if he could have caught him, to the satisfaction of the Legate. "Le dit

Innocent  
condemns  
Count  
Raymond

Comte Raimond étoit si courroucé et fâché de ce meurtre, comme ayant été fait par un homme à lui, que jamais il ne fut si courroucé de chose au monde."—Hist. de la Guerre des Albigeois; Guizot, Coll. des Mémoires, xv. 4. All modern writers, D. Vaissette, Capefigue, Hahn, even Hurter more doubtfully, exculpate Raymond.

day was to be published the excommunication of Raymond of Toulouse the murderer, and all his accomplices: no faith was to be kept with those who had kept no faith; <sup>y</sup> all his subjects were absolved from their oath of allegiance: every one was at liberty to assault his person, and (only reserving the right of his suzerain the King of France) to seize and take possession of his lands, especially for the holy purpose of purging them of heresy. The only terms on which Raymond could be admitted to repentance were the previous absolute expulsion of all heretics from his dominions.

But the blood of the martyr <sup>z</sup> (as he at once became) called for more active vengeance. Innocent Crusade. seized the instant of indignation at this almost unprecedented and terrible crime, to awaken the tardy zeal, to inflame the ambition and rapacity of those, who at the same time might win to themselves, by the favour of the Church, a place in heaven and a goodly inheritance upon earth. "Up," he writes to Philip Augustus of France; "Up, soldiers of Christ! Up, most Christian king! Hear the cry of blood; aid us in wreaking vengeance on these malefactors." With strange perverted quotations from the sacred Scriptures, he makes Moses and St. Peter, the Fathers, as he calls them, of the Old and New Testaments, predict this amicable union of the royal and sacerdotal powers, and the two swords (one of which his gentle master afterwards commanded the rash disciple to put away) autho-

<sup>y</sup> "Cum juxta sanctorum patrum canonicas sanctiones, qui Deo fidem non servat, fides servanda non est." Epist. Innocent. xi. 26.

<sup>z</sup> Peter of Castelnau's body would have wrought wonderful miracles, but

for the obstinate incredulity of the people. "Claris jam, ut credimus, miraculis coruscasset, nisi hoc illorum incredulitas impediret." And the passage of St. Luke is adduced without hesitation.

rise the united Crusade of the kingdom of France and the Church of Rome against the inhabitants of Languedoc. "Up," in the same tone, cried the Pope to all the adventurous nobles and knights of France, and offered to their valour the rich and sunny lands of the South.<sup>a</sup>

The Crusade was thus not merely an outburst of religious zeal, it took into close alliance strong motives of political ambition, perhaps the hostility of rival races. Philip Augustus, who had almost expelled the King of England from the continent, aspired to raise the feudal sovereignty of the crown over the great fiefs of the South to actual dominion. Instead of an almost independent prince, the Count of Toulouse, with his princely nobles, must become an obedient vassal and subject. The French of the North up to this period had vainly endeavoured to extend their rule over the Gallo-Roman, or Gothic Roman population of the South. The language divided and defined the two yet unmixed races. A religious crusade was a glorious opportunity to break the power of these rival sovereigns rather than dependent vassals. Throughout the war the Crusaders are described as the Franks, as a foreign nation invading a separate territory. While there was little of the sympathy of kindred or of order to prevent the princes and nobles of Northern France from wreaking the vengeance

<sup>a</sup> "Attende per Moisem et Petrum, patres videlicet utriusque Testamenti, signatam inter regnum et sacerdotium unitatem, cum alter regnum sacerdotale prædixit et reliquus regale sacerdotium appellavit; ad quod signandum Rex Regum et Dominus dominantium Jesus Christus, secundum ordinem Melchisedek sacerdotis et regis, de utra-

que voluit stirpe nasci, sacerdotali videlicet et regali. Et princeps Apostolorum, 'Ecce gladii duo hic,' id est simul, dicenti Domino, 'satis est,' legitur respondisse, ut materiali et spirituali gladiis sibi invicem assistentibus, alter per alterum adjuvetur."—Epist. ibid. And the world heard with awe this sanguinary and impious nonsense !

of the Church upon the rebellious Princes of Languedoc, the great warlike prelates of France were bound by a still stronger tie to the endangered cause of their brother prelates of the South. There had been quite enough of heresy threatening the peace of almost every diocese of France to awaken their jealous vigilance. The less they possessed the virtues of churchmen the more fierce their warlike zeal for the Church. So in the first ranks of the Crusade appear the Archbishops of Rheims, Sens, Rouen. The wealth and prosperity of the Southern provinces, the hope of plunder, was of itself sufficient incentive to the baser adventurers; to the nobler there was the chivalrous passion for war and enterprise; while the easier mode of obtaining pardon for sins, without the long, and toilsome, and perilous and costly journey to the Holy Land, brought the superstitious of all ranks in throngs under the consecrated banners. The clergy everywhere preached with indefatigable activity this new way of attaining everlasting life; the Cistercian convents threw open their gates, the land was covered with monks haranguing on the same stirring topic. From all parts of France they assembled in countless numbers at Lyons; a second not less formidable host was gathering in the West; the number is stated at 500,000, 300,000, at least 50,000 men of arms.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>b</sup> "Il s'y croisa tant de gens que personne ne les saurait nombrer ni estimer, et elle a cause des grands pardons et des absolutions, que le Légit avait donnés à tous ceux qui se croiseraient pour aller contre les hérétiques." — Hist. de la Guerre, Guizot, xv. 5. "Cependant aussi loin que s'étend la sainte Chrétienté,

en France et en tous les autres royaumes . . . les peuples se croisent, dès qu'ils apprennent le pardon de leurs pêchés, et jamais je pense, ne fut fait si grand host, que celui fait alors contre les hérétiques." — Fauriel, p. 15. Petr. V. C. adds that to obtain the indulgence they were to be "contriti et confessi."

Raymond, as he well might, stood aghast; he had done all in his power to obtain peace from <sup>conduct of</sup> Rome. He rejected the gallant proposal of <sup>conduct of</sup> Raymond his nephew the Viscount of Beaucaire, to summon their vassals and kindred, garrison their castles, and stand boldly on their defence.<sup>c</sup> He sent an embassy to Rome, the Archbishop of Auch, the Abbot of Condom, de Rabenstein the ex-Bishop of Toulouse, the Prior of the Hospitallers (he had yet some ecclesiastics on his side, hated with proportionate intensity by his enemies).<sup>d</sup> The demands of Innocent were hard, and those, it is said with something of old Troubadour malice, gained by many presents;<sup>e</sup> the surrender of seven of his chief castles as guarantees for the Count's submission.

A new Legate had been named, Milo the Notary of the Papal Court, a man of milder views, of whom Raymond, under the fond delusion of hope, said that he was a Legate after his own heart. But this was only craft on the part of the Pope; it was not yet his object to drive Count Raymond, before his great vassals were subdued, to desperation. Milo was accompanied by Theodisc, a canon of Genoa, of less yielding character; and no measure was to be taken without the approbation of Arnold, the Cistercian Abbot.<sup>f</sup> The Bishop of Conferans was added to the legatine commission. Milo was enjoined to use all wise dissimulation; every thing was to be done to lull and delude Count Raymond.<sup>g</sup> The Legates appeared in Languedoc; it was

<sup>c</sup> Histoire des Guerres.

<sup>d</sup> "Execrabilis et malignus Arche-piscopum Auxitanum," &c.—Petr. V. C. c. ix.

<sup>e</sup> "Ils disent si bonnes paroles et font tant de présents."—p. 19.

<sup>f</sup> The Pope says expressly to Milo: "Abbas Cisterci totum faciet, et tu organum ejus eris: Comes enim Tolosanus eum habet suspectum; tu non eris ei suspectus."

<sup>g</sup> Epist. xi. 232. "Cum talis dolus

of no auspicious omen that they had first visited France.<sup>h</sup>

From religious awe, from conscious inability to resist, perhaps from some generous hope of obtaining gentler terms for his devoted subjects, Raymond of Toulouse submitted at once in the amplest manner to the demands of his inexorable enemies, to the personal Penance of abasement inflicted by the Church. The scene Raymond. June 18, 1209. of his humiliation may not be passed over. At a Council at Montelimart he was cited to appear before the Legates at Valence. There he first surrendered, as security for his absolute submission, his seven strong castles—Oppède, Montferrand, Balmes, Mornac, Roquemaure, Fourques, Fanjaux.<sup>i</sup> He was then led, naked to the girdle, to the porch of the abbey church, and in the presence of the Legates, and not less than twenty bishops, before the holy Eucharist, before certain reliques, and the wood of the true cross, with his hand upon the holy Gospels, he acknowledged the justice of his excommunication, and swore full allegiance to the Pope and to his Legate. He swore to give ample satisfaction, according to the Pope's orders, on all the charges made against him, now recapitulated with terrible exactness—his refusal to make peace, his protection of heretics, his violations of ecclesiastical property. If he did not fulfil his oath his seven castles were at once escheated to the Church of Rome: the

prudentia sit dicendus." Such are Innocent's own damning words. The whole letter is in the same tone.

<sup>h</sup> Raymond had endeavoured to obtain the protection of Philip Augustus, his liege lord for Languedoc; of the Emperor Otho, of whom he held the

Marquisate of Provence. The King and Emperor were at war (Philip therefore did not join the Crusade); each refused to interpose, unless on condition of breaking with his enemy.

<sup>i</sup> See in Vaissette, p. 162, the situation and strength of these castles.

county of Melgueil, which he held of the Church of Rome, reverted to its liege lord: himself fell under excommunication, his lands under interdict; his compurgators, the Consuls of the towns in his dominions, were absolved from their allegiance, that allegiance passed to the Church of Rome. He swore further to respect the rights of all the churches in the provinces of Narbonne, Arles, Vienne, Auch, Bordeaux, Bourges. The Consuls of Avignon, Nismes, and St. Gilles took their compurgatorial oath to his fulfilment of all these stipulations; the governors of the seven castles not to restore them to the Count of Toulouse without the consent of the Pope. These ceremonies ended, the Count, with a rope round his neck, and scourged, as he went, on his naked shoulders, was led up to the high altar: there after a solemn recapitulation of the Pope's commands before it, and a reiteration of the same commands after it, he received the absolution.<sup>k</sup> But his humiliation was not complete; by a well-contrived accident, the crowd was so great that they were obliged to lead him close by the tomb of the murdered Peter of Castelnau; naked, bleeding, broken-spirited, he was forced to show his profound respect to that spot.<sup>m</sup>

But he has not yet drunk the dregs of humiliation: new difficulties arise; new demands are made: Raymond joins the Crusade. the Count himself must take up the cross against his own loyal subjects; he must appear at the head, he must actually seem to direct the operations of the invading army. Two only of his knights follow his example. His deadly enemy assigns one nobler motive

<sup>k</sup> Petr. V. C. c. xii.

<sup>m</sup> "O justum Dei judicium! quem | tiam compulsus est exhibere et de-  
enim contempserat vivum, ei reveren- | functo."—Petr. V. C. apud Bouquet,  
xix. 80.

for this act, that he might avert the Crusade from his own subjects, another (the vulgar suggestion of hatred) hypocrisy.<sup>n</sup> He did not leave the army till after the fall of Carcassonne.

The war was inevitable; not even the Pope could now have arrested it; and the Pope himself is self-convicted of the most cunning dissimulation. This vast army must have its reward in plunder and massacre.<sup>o</sup> The subtle distinction is at hand, it is not waged against the Count of Toulouse, against the Count of Languedoc, but against the heretics.

Never in the history of man were the great eternal principles of justice, the faith of treaties, common humanity so trampled under foot as in the Albigensian war. Never was war waged in which ambition, the consciousness of strength, rapacity, implacable hatred, and pitiless cruelty played a greater part. And throughout the war it cannot be disguised that it was not merely the army of the Church, but the Church itself in arms. Papal legates and the greatest prelates headed the host, and mingled in all the horrors of the battle and the siege. In no instance did they interfere to arrest the massacre, in some cases urged it on. "Slay all, God will know his own," was the boasted saying of Abbot Arnold, Legate of the Pope, before Beziers. Arnold was the captain-general of the army.<sup>p</sup> Hardly one of the great prelates of France stood aloof. With the first

<sup>n</sup> "Ut sic terram suam a cruce signatorum infestatione tueretur . . . O falsum et perfidissimum crucesignatum! Comitem Tolosanum dico, qui crucem assumpsit, non ad vindicandam injuriam crucifixi, sed ut ad tempus celare possit suam et tegere pravitatem."—Ibid.

<sup>o</sup> "Man wollte," writes Hurter, who would apologise for the Crusade, "so grosse Rüstungen nicht vergeblich unternommen haben!" The army of the faith (the faith of Jesus Christ!) must not disperse without blood and plunder!

<sup>p</sup> Vaissette.

army were, at the head of their troops, the Archbishops of Rheims, Sens, Rouen ; their suffragans of Autun, Clermont, Nevers, Bayeux, Lisieux, Chartres. The Western host was led by the Archbishop of Bordeaux, the Bishops of Limoges, Bazas, Cahors, Agen. A third force moved under the Bishop of Puy. The great engineer was the Archdeacon of Paris. Fulk Bishop of Toulouse has been described as the ecclesiastical De Montfort of the Crusade.<sup>a</sup> We have the melancholy advantage of hearing the actual voice of one of the churchmen, who joined the army at an early period ; and whose language may be taken as the expression of the concentrated hatred and bigotry, which was the soul of the enterprise. The Historian Peter, Monk of Vaux Cernay, attendant on his uncle, the Abbot of that monastery, is the boastful witness to all these unexampled cruelties. Monkish fanaticism could not speak more naturally, more forcibly. With him all wickedness is centred in heresy. The heretic is a beast of prey to be slain wherever he may be found.<sup>r</sup> And if there might be some palliation for the clergy of Languedoc, who had been neglected, treated with contumely, perhaps with insult, had seen their churches not only deserted, perhaps sacrilegiously violated, the Monk of Vaux Cernay was a stranger to that part of France.<sup>s</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Fulk had now altogether forgotten all the favours of Raymond, of the kings of Castile and Arragon. "Il ne vit dans Raymond VI., et dans Pierre II., roi d'Arragon, leur fils, que des princes qui se refusaient à l'extermination des hérétiques, que des rebelles, qui ne se soumettaient pas implicitement à la domination du clergé, et il devint le plus acharné de leurs ennemis."—Hist. Littér. xix. p. 596.

<sup>r</sup> e.g. "Les Notres passèrent au fil d'épée ceux qu'ils purent trouver, mettant tout à feu et à sang. Pour quoi soit en toutes choses beni le Seigneur qui nous livre quelques impies, bien que non pas tous!"—Coll. des Mémoires, p. 303.

<sup>s</sup> Peter (who dedicates his work to Innocent III.) seems to have been as ignorant, as cruel and fanatic. His notions of the opinions of the heretics

The army which moved from Lyons along the Rhône came from every province of France. Its numbers were never known. The Troubadour declares that God never made the clerk who could have written the muster-roll in two months, or even in three. He reckons twenty thousand knights, two hundred thousand common soldiers, not reckoning the townsmen and the clerks.<sup>t</sup> The chief secular leaders were Eudes Duke of Burgundy, Hervé Count of Nevers, the Count of St. Pol, and Simon de Montfort Count of Leicester. The army advanced along the Rhône, joined as it proceeded by the vast contingents of the Archbishop of Bordeaux and the Bishop of Puy. At Montpellier they were met by the young and gallant Viscount of Beziers,<sup>u</sup> who having urged his uncle Count Raymond to resistance, now endeavoured to avert the storm from his two cities, Beziers and Carcassonne. But his ruin was determined.<sup>v</sup> The army appeared before Beziers, which in the strength of its walls and the courage of its inhabitants<sup>y</sup> (the Catholics made common cause with

Siege of  
Beziers.  
July 22, 1209.

are a strange wild jumble. They were not only Manicheans, denying the Old Testament, and Docetæ: they held the most horrible doctrines concerning John the Baptist, “one of the worst of devils;” and our Lord himself, who was spiritually in the person of Paul. (Is this Paulicianism?) The Good God had two wives, Collent and Collebent, by whom he had sons and daughters. Another sect said “God had two sons, Christ and the Devil.” Peter’s history is in Bouquet, t. xix., and in M. Guizot’s Collection of Mémoires, t. xv.

<sup>t</sup> “Dieu ne fit jamais latiniste ou cleric si lettré—qui (de tout cela) pût raconter la moitié ni le tiers [of their

crosses, banners, and barded horses] ou écrire les noms des (seuls) prêtres et abbés.” The Archbishop of Bourges was alone prevented from serving by death.—Fauriel, 15.

<sup>u</sup> According to the Troubadour, the Viscount was “bon Catholique; je vous donne pour garanti maint clerc et maint chanoine (mangeant) en réfectoire.”—p. 27.

<sup>v</sup> “Der Legat ergrimmte ob solcher Hartnäckigkeit, wohl an denn rief er, so soll auch kein Stein auf dem andern, kein leben geschont werden.”—Hurter, p. 309.

<sup>y</sup> “Fortis enim et nimium locuples, populosaque valde—urbs erat, arma-

the rest) ventured on bold defiance. The Bishop Reginald of Montpellier demanded the surrender of all whom he might designate as heretics. On their refusal of these terms, the city was stormed.<sup>z</sup> A general massacre followed; neither age nor sex were spared; even priests fell in the remorseless carnage. Then was uttered the frightful command, become almost a proverb, "Slay them all, God will know his own." In the church of St. Mary Magdalene were killed seven thousand by the defenders of the sanctity of the Church. The account of the slain is variously estimated from twenty thousand even up to fifty thousand. The city was set on fire, even the Cathedral perished in the flames.<sup>a</sup>

The next was Carcassonne. The Viscount of Beziers, in his despair, had thrown himself into the <sup>of Carcas-</sup>city with a strong body of troops. The monk re-<sub>sonne</sub>lates with special indignation that these worst of heretics and infidels destroyed the refectory and the cellars of the Canons of Carcassonne, and even (more execrable!) the stalls of their church, to strengthen their defences. Pedro King of Arragon appeared as mediator in the

tisque viris et milite multo—freta."<sup>b</sup>

—Gul. Brito.

<sup>b</sup> The Troubadour relates a singular circumstance: the first attack was made by the "Roi des Ribauds," with 15,000 truands, in shirts and breeches, but without chaussures. They climbed the walls, and swarmed in the trenches. They got all the plunder, which they were obliged to give up to the Barons.—p. 35. Was this wild rout a common part of a crusading army?—See the Geste of Jerusalem, where the Roi des Ribauds plays the same part in the taking of Antioch and Jerusalem.

—Hist. Lit. de la France, t. xxii. p. 363-377.

<sup>a</sup> "O justissima divinæ dispensationis mensura! Fuit enim capta civitas sæpe dicta in festo S. Mariæ Magdalenaæ." The monk howls out his delight at this judgement of God on account of a tenet, which he absurdly ascribes to the heretics, "S. Mariam Magdalenam fuisse concubinam Christi." The Viscount of Beziers had left the town (probably to defend Carcassonne; as did the Jews: "Les Juifs l'ont suivi de près." The Jews had no vocation to wait and be massacred.

camp of the Crusaders. Carcassonne was held as a fief of the King. He pleaded the youth of the Viscount; asserted his Catholic belief, his aversion to heresy: it was not his fault if his subjects had fallen away: he was ready to submit to the Legate. The only terms they would offer were, that he might retire with twelve knights; the city must surrender at discretion. The proud and gallant youth declared that nothing should induce him (he had rather be flayed alive) to desert the least of his subjects.<sup>b</sup> The first assaults, though on one occasion the bishops and abbots and all the clergy went forth chanting “Veni Creator Spiritus,”<sup>c</sup> on another were lavish in their promises of absolution,<sup>d</sup> ended in failure.

Carcassonne, if equal care had been taken to provision as to fortify the city, might have resisted for a year that disorderly host. But multitudes from all quarters had found refuge within its walls. The wells began to fail; infectious diseases broke out. Ere eight days the Viscount accepted a free conduct from an officer of the Legate: he hoped to obtain moderate terms for his subjects. Most of the troops made their

<sup>August 15.</sup> escape by subterranean passages, and the defenceless city came into the power of the Crusaders.<sup>e</sup> The people were allowed to leave the town, but almost naked;<sup>f</sup> they were pillaged to the utmost.

<sup>b</sup> “Cela (dit alors le roi entre ses  
dents) se fera tout aussitôt qu'un âne  
volera dans le ciel.”—Fauriel, p. 51.

<sup>c</sup> Peter V. C. xvi.

<sup>d</sup> “Les évêques, les prieurs, les  
moines, et les abbés . . . s'en vont  
criant, vite au pardon (croisés) que  
faisiez vous?”—Fauriel, 51.

\* The modern historians of this war

have wrought up a Walter Scott scene  
of treachery, on slender foundations.  
Barra et Darragan, Croisades contre  
les Albigeois.

<sup>e</sup> “Egressi sunt ergo omnes nudi  
de civitate, nihil secum praeter pecca-  
tum portantes.” Peter V. C.—“on ne  
leur avait pas laissé en sus (chose) qui  
vaut un bouton.”—Fauriel, 55.

But the Legate would not allow his soldiers, under pain of excommunication, to share the plunder. It was to be reserved for a powerful baron, who was to rule the land and extirpate the heretics for ever. The Viscount had given himself up as a hostage;<sup>g</sup> he was treated as a prisoner, cast into a dungeon, where he died in a few months, not without suspicion of poison administered by Simon de Montfort. But a broken spirit and foul dungeon air may relieve Simon from a charge always asserted, rarely to be proved or disproved. The Viscount died at the age of twenty-four.<sup>h</sup>

Death of  
Viscount  
of Beziers.  
Nov. 10, 1209.

The law of conquest was now to be put in force. The lands of a heretic were as the lands of a Saracen. The question was to which of the orthodox army should be assigned the first fruits of the victory. The French nobles, the Dukes of Burgundy, the Counts of Nevers and St. Pol, with disdainful indignation refused the reward of a mercenary: they had land enough of their own; nor would they set the perilous example of setting up the fiefs of France to the hazard of the sword. The zeal of Simon de Montfort was not so noble nor so disinterested.<sup>i</sup> He was invested, on the Pope's authority, with all the lands conquered or to be conquered during the Crusade. This was of fearful omen to Raymond of Toulouse. Only a sovereign of the whole land, of unimpeachable devotion to the Holy See, of indefatigable

<sup>g</sup> "Et chose grandement folle, fit-il, a mon avis." This historian paints the treachery of the Legate very darkly. Vaissette says that he was seized during a conference. I have followed the account least unfavourable to the perfidious Legate-Abbot.

<sup>h</sup> Innocent's letter has *miserabiliter interfectus*. This was the accusation of the King of Arragon.

<sup>i</sup> Peter ascribes to him a show of repugnance. The historian briefly says that Simon, "qui le désirait le prit."

activity, dauntless courage, inflexible resolution, an iron heart, could subdue the realm to ecclesiastical obedience.

The submission of Raymond had been complete ; it might be suspected of insincerity, it assuredly was compulsory ; yet he had accepted the hard terms, and surrendered his castles, had undergone the basest personal humiliation.<sup>k</sup> The Pope had even expressed his approbation, and welcomed him back into the bosom of the Church. Up to the taking of Carcassonne, it might be with a bleeding heart, he had remained in the Crusaders' army. He had even attempted to conciliate Simon de Montfort, by the demand of De Montfort's daughter in marriage for his son.

But Raymond had been too deeply injured to be forgiven ; and nothing less than the whole South could fully repay the zeal and valour of the Crusaders. The treachery of the Count rests on suspicion ; that of the Legate, and it must be sadly confessed, of the Pope himself, on his own words. Treachery was his deliberate, avowed design. Innocent had enjoined, and now only followed out his policy of deceiving Count Raymond by feigned reconciliation, so to separate him from the rest of the Languedocian nobles, and to destroy them, one by one, with the greater ease. And to justify this, the Vicar of Christ abuses the words of an Apostle of Christ.<sup>m</sup>

<sup>k</sup> Epist. xii. 90. The monk relates this story :—Two heretics were condemned to be burned. One offered to recant. A great altercation arose whether he was to be spared. The Count decided that he should be burned. “If he is a true convert, the fire will be an expiation for his sins. If not, it will be a just penalty

for his sins.” The man was saved by something like a miracle.—c. xxii. Can this be true?

<sup>m</sup> “Quia vero a nobis sollicite est requisitum, qualiter procedendum sit circa comitatum eundem fideli exerciti (cruce) signatorum, quatenus ad apostoli dicentis, ‘Cum essem astutus, dolo vos copi,’ magisterium recur-

The Legates were apt disciples of their master. It was easy to demand impossible things, to assume the breach of the stipulations on which the Count had received absolution, and to claim the forfeiture. The Legates seem to have dreaded the influence of Raymond's agents at Rome; they suspected even the Pope of weak lenity. The Count had boasted that the Emperor Otho, and even the King of France, had interceded in his behalf. Instead, therefore, of immediately renewing the excommunication and the interdict on account of fifteen articles, on which they charged him with not having fulfilled his promises, they allowed him a certain time to give full satisfaction. The seven castles, they significantly hinted, of which he prayed the restitution, were strong enough to resist any attack, and had already escheated to the See of Rome.<sup>a</sup>

Raymond had hardly returned to Toulouse, when an embassy arrived from the Legate Arnold and Simon de Montfort, demanding the instant surrender of all heretics and all abettors of heresy within his dominions to the ecclesiastical power, and of all their property to be at the disposal of the Crusaders. In vain it was pleaded by some of the designated fautors of heresy that they were of orthodox belief, and had been already reconciled to the Church by the Legate himself. In vain Count Raymond declared that he appealed to the Pope. At Valence the excommunication was again hurled against his person, the interdict

rentes, cum talis dolus prudentia  
potius sit dicendus, cum eorundem  
signatorum prudentioribus opportuno  
consilio, divisos ab ecclesiæ unitate  
divisum capere studentes, dummodo  
videritis quod ex hoc item comes vel  
aliis minus assistere, vel per se ipsum

minus debeat insanire, non statim incipientes ab ipso, sed eo primitus *arte prudentis dissimulationis eluso*, ad extirpandos alios haereticos transeat. —  
Epist. 232.

<sup>a</sup> Compare the two letters of Milo, the Legate, to the Pope.—xii. 106, 107

laid on his dominions. Raymond seized the desperate measure of going himself to Rome, and throwing himself on the justice, he might fondly hope the mercy, of the Pope. Innocent, in the mean time, had committed himself to a triumphant approbation of all the exploits of the Crusaders; he had invested Simon de Montfort in the conquered territories, and exhorted him, for the remission of his sins, as he had extirpated, so to keep his new realm free from the contagion of heresy.<sup>o</sup> Simon de Montfort is his beloved son, the acknowledged hero of the Holy War.<sup>p</sup>

Raymond visited the Court of France before he went <sup>Raymond</sup> to Rome. His reception by the Pope was not <sup>in Rome.</sup> promising. The Pope, by one account, heaped on him so many reproaches as almost to reduce him to despair.<sup>q</sup> According to others, he was received with courtesy by the Pope and by the Cardinals. Innocent spoke with fairness on the restitution of the castles: it did not become the Church of Rome to enrich itself with such spoils: the right of the Count was by no means annulled by the cession. The Pope condescended to hear the confession of Count Raymond; showed him the Veronica, and allowed him to touch the holy face

<sup>o</sup> In remissionem tibi peccaminum injungentes quatenus attendendo prudenter quod non minor est virtus quam querere, parta tueri."—Epist. xii. 123.

<sup>p</sup> The Pope wrote to the Archbishops of Arles, Besançon, Vienne, Aix, Narbonne, Lyons, and others, to compel by ecclesiastical censures all who had lent money to the Crusaders, especially the Jews—there must have been more than censures against the Jews—not to exact interest (it passed

under the odious name of usury) for their loans.—xii. 136.

<sup>q</sup> "Quem Dominus Papa tot conviciis laceravit, contumeliis tot confudit, quod quasi in desperatione positus, quid ageret, ignorabat. Ipsum siquidem dicebat incredulum, crucis persecutorem, fidei inimicum, et vere sic erat."—Petr. V. C. c. 33. The monk may have given to the Pope some of his own bitter passion. The historian says Raymond was received with honour.

of the Lord ; he gave him absolution ; bestowed on him a costly mantle and a precious ring from his own fingers. The harshness would perhaps be hardly less Papal than these specious courtesies. From Innocent's words and acts, it is clear that these outward honours were cautiously, jealously, if not deceptively bestowed. Notwithstanding the absolution, Count Raymond was to appear in three months before a council to be assembled by the Legates, to purge himself from all charge of countenancing heretics, and all concern in the murder of Peter of Castelnau. What may be called the secret instructions to the Legate (Milo was dead), to the Abbot Arnold, recommended him to consult on all points the Canon Theodisc, who was alone in possession of the Pope's real sentiments. But Theodisc was to act only under the orders of Arnold, to be his instrument of deception, under the bait of feigned gentleness to conceal the iron hook of severity, and so delude again the devoted Count.<sup>r</sup> It was Innocent's object not to goad him to despair. Raymond must not be driven to head the strong reaction which had already begun against the usurpation and tyranny of De Montfort.<sup>s</sup>

The success of the Crusade had been beyond expectation : the two strong cities, Beziers and Carcassonne, had fallen in little more than two months. From the panic, and from force, five hundred

Progress of  
Crusade.

<sup>r</sup> “ In hamo sagacitatis tue positus quasi esca, ut per eam piscem capias fluctuantem, cui tanquam saluberriam tue pescatationis abhorrenti doctrinam quodam prudenti mansuetudinis artificio severitatis ferrum necessarium est abscondi.” And Innocent again makes his favourite quotation : “ Cum essem astutus dolo vos cepi.”

<sup>s</sup> “ Veruntamen cogitans Dominus Papa, ne in desperationem versus ecclesiam, quæ in Narbonensi provincia erat, impugnaret acrius et manifestius dictus comes, indixit ei.” He orders him to clear himself of the crime of heresy, and that of the murderer.—Petr. V. C. c. 33.

castles and towns had surrendered or yielded after a short siege.<sup>t</sup> The Count of Toulouse, the King of Arragon, had issued decrees against the heretics. The Count of Foix (De Montfort had entered Castres), with Albi, Pamiers, Mirepois, offered terms. Simon de Montfort had now a kingdom. But on the approach of winter, far the larger part of the French barons, bishops, and knights returned home; De Montfort remained with the few troops whom he could afford to pay. The Pope, indeed, commanded the archbishops to give up to Simon, for the maintenance of his army, large sums which the heretics, or those accused of heresy, had deposited in their hands for safe custody. But many towns had already raised the standard of revolt; the King of Arragon resolutely refused his homage for the parts of the territory which were his fiefs. But with the spring new crusaders crowded around De Montfort's banner, the Bishops of Chartres and Beauvais. Many towns and castles, Alyonne, Bram, Alairac, Ventalon, Montreal, Constassa, Puyvert, Castres, Lomberes, fell.

<sup>Siege of  
Minerve.  
A.D. 1210.</sup> Minerve, a fortress of great strength at the border of the Cevennes, on a high rock girded by deep ravines, made a long and vigorous resistance. Provisions failed; the lord of the castle proposed to surrender. Now appeared the darkening atrocity of the war.<sup>u</sup> Even De Montfort would have accepted the

<sup>t</sup> "Captisque fere quingentis tum castellis, quæ per possessos suos diabolus habitabat."—Petr. V. C.

<sup>u</sup> According to the monk of Vaux Cernay, Gerald de Pepieux had betrayed Simon de Montfort; he was a cruel enemy of the faith, and had barbarously mutilated some of his soldiers.—c. 27. Mutilation became

a common practice. The monk, of course, lays the blame of commencing it on the heretics, for Simon was the gentlest (*mitissimus*) of mankind.—c. 34. Montfort, in fact, had put to the sword the garrisons of several castles belonging to Pepieux. The whole garrison of Montlaur was hanged. A hundred of that of Bram had their

capitulation; but the fiercer Cistercian Abbot, unwilling that the enemies of God should escape, sought even fraudulent means of baffling or eluding the treaty. De Montfort left it to the decision of the Abbot, who as a churchman could not openly urge the rejection of pacific terms.\* Arnold decided that of the heretics all *believers* who should absolutely submit to the mandates of the Church, should have their lives spared: even the Perfect, of whom there were multitudes, might escape if they would recant. A fierce knight, Robert de Molesme, the agent of De Montfort with the Pope, protested against this ill-timed leniency. "Fear not," said the Abbot, "few will there be whose lives will be spared." Minerve surrendered. The cross was placed on the keep of the castle, the banner of De Montfort waved below it. Arnold was right.<sup>y</sup> The Abbot of Vaux Cernay preached in vain to the heretics; the women were more obstinate than the men. A hundred and forty of the Perfect spared their persecutors the trouble of casting them on the vast pile; they rushed headlong of their own accord into the flames. July 23.

The castle of Termes was of still greater strength; it might defy with a prudent and resolute commander (an

eyes put out; one eye was left to the captain, in order to conduct his soldiers to Cabaret.—Vaissette, iii. p. 191. A priest, who had revolted from De Montfort, was taken to Carcassonne, degraded, dragged at the tail of a horse through the town, then hanged.

\* Histoire de la Guerre, Petr. V. C. I quote the French: "A ces paroles l'Abbé fut grandement marri pour le désir qu'il avait que les ennemis du

Christ fussent mis à mort, et n'osant cependant les y condamner vu qu'il était moine et prêtre."—In Collection des Mémoires.

<sup>y</sup> Petr. V. C. c. 36, 37. Miracles followed the capture of Minerve, "et ils brûlaient maint felon d'hérétique (fils) de pute chienne, et mainte folle mécreante, qui brait dans le feu." Such is the brief merciless account of the Troubadour, p. 79. Compare the Histoire, c. xviii.

obstinate heretic) any attack. The siege lasted four months; the Bishops of Beauvais and Chartres,  
 of Termes.<sup>z</sup> as well as the Count Robert and the Count of Poitou, retired in despair.<sup>z</sup> The great engineer, the Archdeacon of Paris, adhered to the army to the last. The garrison broke away at length through subterranean Nov. 23, passages. The Governor was taken and shut 1210. up in a dungeon for life; the town given up to plunder; the heretics burned; their shrieks were mocked by their persecutors.<sup>a</sup>

The Count of Toulouse now urged the fulfilment of the Pope's decree. He offered to appear before a Council to justify himself concerning the charges on which he was arraigned. But the crafty churchmen, the Genoese Canon Theodisc (the depositor of the Pope's secret views), and the Abbot Arnold (with whom was now joined the Bishop of Riez), had other intentions.

Sept. 1210. They contrived delays; they made demands, New de- and insisted that such demands should be Count Raymond. rigidly accomplished before they would admit him to compurgation.<sup>b</sup> A council was at length held at St. Gilles. When the Count found his adversaries so utterly implacable, he was moved, it is said, to tears.

<sup>a</sup> The French knights were so disposed to gain the advantages of Indulgences on the easiest terms, that the Legate was obliged to order that no one should receive an Indulgence without forty days' service. Petr. V. C. c. 43.

<sup>b</sup> In this fearful civil war the Bishop of Carcassonne was among the Crusaders. His brother, William of Rochefort, as the monk says, one of the worst and most cruel enemies of the Church, was with Raymond, who commanded in Termes.

"Cum intrasset magister Theodiscus Tholosam, habuit secretum colloquium cum Abbe Cisterciensi super admittendā purgatione Comitis Tholosani. Magister vero Theodiscus, ut pote circumspectus et providus, ad hoc omnimodis aspirabat, ut possit de jure repellere ab indicandā ei purgatione comitem memoratum." They charitably averred "facillime, immo lubentissime, per se et suos complices pejeraret."—*l. 39.*

The stony-hearted churchman scoffed in Scriptural language at his hypocritical weeping.<sup>c</sup> He left St. Gilles burthened with a new anathema. Another conference at Narbonne was equally without effect, and still another at Montpellier. At length, at a council in Arles, the Legates boldly threw off all concealment of their inflexible hatred. They summoned the Count before their tribunal, and haughtily commanded him not to leave the city without their permission.<sup>d</sup> Feb. 1212.

Their terms were these: I. That Count Raymond should lay down his arms, dismiss his troops, not retaining a single follower. II. That he should be obedient to the Church, pay all the expenses which they might charge on him, and during his whole life submit himself without contradiction. III. In the whole kingdom no one should eat of more than two kinds of meat. IV. That he should expel all heretics and their abettors from his dominions. V. That before the end of the year he should deliver up to the Legate and to Count de Montfort every person whom they might demand, to be dealt with according to their arbitrement. VI. No one in his dominions, either noble or serf, was to wear costly garments, only dark and coarse mantles. VII. He was to raze all fortresses and castles in his dominions. VIII. No one of his men, unless a noble, was to live within any walled town. IX. No taxes to be levied in

<sup>c</sup> "In diluvio aquarum multarum ad Deum non approximatis." So the Vulgate. Our version is, "Surely in the floods of great waters they shall not come nigh him." Ps. xxxii. 6. The canon spake thus: "Sciens quod lacrymar illæ non erant lacrymæ devotionis et pœnitentiae sed nequitiae et doloris"—(doli?)—Ibid.

<sup>d</sup> The Legates were greatly offended that Count Raymond had left Montpellier abruptly, without even the courtesy of taking leave. He had seen an evil omen (says the monk) the St. Mark's bird. "Ipse enim more Saracenorum in volatu et canticis auguriis spem habebat."—Petr. V. C.

the land, except the ancient and statutable payments. X. Every head of a family was to pay yearly fourpence to the Legate, to be collected by the Legate's agents. XI. All tithe to be restored to the Church, and all arrears of tithe. XII. When the Legate travelled through the land, he was to be entertained without cost: his meanest follower was not to pay for anything. XIII. When he had executed all these conditions, Count Raymond was to set out on a crusade against the infidel Turks, and not return without permission of the Legate. XIV. All these terms duly fulfilled, his lands would be restored to him by the Legate and the Count de Montfort.<sup>e</sup>

These terms were dictated, it was thought, by the Count's irreconcileable enemy, the Bishop of Toulouse. The King of Arragon was in Arles. He had been jealously watching the course of events.<sup>f</sup> At Montpellier he had reluctantly received the homage of Simon de Montfort for Carcassonne. At the same time he had strengthened his connexion with the House of Toulouse by the marriage of his daughter Sancha with the young Count Raymond. At these extravagant demands, Raymond broke out into bitter laughter. "You are well paid," said the King of Arragon. The ban of excommunication was again pronounced, with more than usual solemnity.

Raymond hastened to Toulouse; he summoned the Council of the city. The Toulousans declared that they would submit to the worst extremity rather than accept such shameful conditions. There was the same enthu-

\* Histoire de la Guerre, xx. Vaissette, iii. note xvi. Chroniques apud Bouquet, p. 136.

<sup>f</sup> Compare the long and striking account of the Troubadour, p. 99.

siasm throughout his dominions. "They would all die. They would eat their own children ere they would abandon their injured sovereign."<sup>5</sup>

War was now declared, but war on what unequal terms! Here stood De Montfort, the resistless conqueror, the absolute model of a crusading chieftain; of noble birth, Lord of Amauri in France, of Evreux in Normandy, Count of Leicester in England. We have seen De Montfort stand majestically alone in the army before Zara, the one knight loyal to the Pope. Faithful to the cause of the Cross, he was unsurpassed in valour as in military skill; beloved by his army, and not alone from their perfect reliance on his unbroken success; his soldierlike gentleness to the true servants of Christ vied with his remorseless hatred of the unbeliever. Which of these virtues did not secure him the most profound adoration from the hierarchy of which he was the champion? A holy monk of the Abbot Arnold's own Cistercian house was interrupted, it was told, in his prayers for the Count of Leicester by a voice from Heaven: "Why pray for him? for him so many pray incessantly, there is no need for thy orisons." And now De Montfort's three ruling passions—religion, ambition, interest, conspired to his grandeur. On the other hand, was the irresolute Count Raymond, only goaded into valour by intolerable fraud and wrong; who without bigotry had betrayed and persecuted the religion of his subjects; now debased by the most miserable humiliation; without military skill, with no fame for prowess in battle; mistrusted by all, as mistrusting himself.

<sup>5</sup> "Les hommes du pays, chevaliers et bourgeois, quand ils entendirent la charte qui leur fut lue . . . dirent qu'ils aimeraient mieux être tous tués ou pris, que de souffrir, ou de faire rien au monde (une chose) qui ferait d'eux tous des serfs, des vilains, ou des paysans."—Fauriel, 102.

Yet the war has in some degree changed its character: it has still all the blackening ferocity of a religious war; but it is also the revolt of a high-spirited nation against a foreign invader; a noble determination to cast off a cruel and usurping tyranny. The Troubadour, the poet of the war, for above three thousand verses has dwelt on the glory of the temporal and spiritual champions of the faith, Simon de Montfort and the Bishop Fulk of Toulouse. He has revelled in the sufferings of the heretics, mocked the shrieks of the burning women.<sup>h</sup> There is a sudden change. The Crusade is now a work of savage iniquity, outraging humanity and religion; Count Raymond is the noblest, most injured of men. But the high Provençal patriotism of the Troubadour is only the love of his country, attachment to the ancient house of the Counts of Toulouse: he has no sympathy for heretic or Albigensian.

In Toulouse the Count and the Bishop could not but come into collision. There was civil war in the city. The Count had foolishly yielded up the strong citadel, "The Narbonnaise." In the city the zealous Catholics prevailed. The Bishop organised a strong confraternity to root out with armed force the heretics, usurers, and Jews. They attacked, and in their religious zeal, pillaged and demolished houses. The borough, on the other side, was inhabited by the nobles. There the heretics had the chief power. Against the White Brethren of the Bishop were arrayed the Black Brethren of the citizens. The Bishop refused to celebrate, to permit the celebration, of any divine office, so long as the city was infected by the presence of an ex-

---

<sup>h</sup> "Mainte folle hérétique beugle dans le feu." This is of the females burned at Mireux.—Compare Fauriel's preface.

communicated person. He had the modesty to request the Count to retire, on the pretence of an excursion, in order that he might perform at least one uncontaminated and undisturbed function.<sup>i</sup> The Count sent word by some of his soldiers that the Bishop himself must leave the city. "I was not elected to my see by a temporal prince, but by ecclesiastical authority. Let him come if he dare; I will encounter his sword with the holy chalice." Yet the Bishop thought himself more safe in the camp of De Montfort, now engaged in the siege of Lavaur.<sup>k</sup>

Lavaur belonged to Roger Bernard, Count of Foix, of all the Provençal princes the most powerful and most detested by the Church, as, if not a <sup>Siege of</sup> Lavaur. heretic, a favourer of heretics. In this case the charge was an honour rather than a calumny. The Count of Foix is claimed by the Waldensians, if not as one of themselves, as having encouraged his son in freedom of faith.<sup>m</sup> A man of profound religion, the Count of Foix had been the first to raise the native standard against De Montfort; he was a knight of valour as of Christian faith. Before Lavaur, the besieging engines were surmounted with a cross; and it was held sacrilegious im-

<sup>i</sup> The Bishop, says the Troubadour, had been established "pour Seigneur dans la ville, avec grande solemnité, comme un empereur."—p. 103.

<sup>k</sup> Petr. V. C. c. 51.

<sup>m</sup> According to the life of Roger Bernard, son of the Count by Hollagarai, quoted in Perrin, *Histoire des Chrétiens Albigens* (Genève, 1615), p. 140, the Count of Foix, on his submission in 1222, answered the Legate—"Certes je vous dirai que je n'ai jamais désiré que de maintenir ma

liberté: car je suis dans le maillot de franchise. . . . Pour le Pape, je ne l'ai point offensé: car il ne m'a rien demandé comme Prince que je ne lui aye obéi. Il ne se doit mesler de ma religion, veu qu'un chacun la doit avoir libre. *Mon père m'a recommandé toujours ceste liberté, asiu qu'êtant en cette posture, quand le ciel crouleroit je le puisse regarder d'un oeil ferme et assuré, estimant qu'il ne me pourrait faire de mal,*" &c. I owe this citation to Gieseler, p. 592.

piety, when the besieged, having battered down one limb of the cross, presumed to scoff. One day the besiegers attempted to storm the city; the engines were driven to the walls, the besieged hurled burning wood and fat upon them; amid all this horrible tumult, the Bishops and the Legates, as before, stood chanting, "Come, Holy Ghost!" At the fall of Lavaur Simon had been irritated by the surprise of a detachment of five thousand German crusaders, who had been cut to pieces by the Count of Foix. The barbarity at Lavaur passed all precedent even in this fearful war. A general massacre was permitted; men, women, children were cut to pieces, till there remained nothing to kill except some of the garrison and others reserved for a more cruel fate. Four hundred were burned in one great pile, which made a wonderful blaze, and caused universal rejoicing in the camp.<sup>n</sup> Aymeric of Montreal, the commander, was brought with eighty nobles (Lavaur seems to have been thought a safe place of refuge) before De Montfort. He ordered them all to be hanged;<sup>o</sup> the overloaded gibbets broke down; they were hewn in pieces. Giralda, the

<sup>May 5,</sup> Lady of Lavaur, was thrown into a well, and <sup>1211.</sup> huge stones rolled down upon her. She was pregnant: her merciless enemy would not even spare her fame; they reported that she accused herself of the most revolting incest.<sup>p</sup> The Troubadour, on the other hand, praises her virtue, her chastity: "no poor man ever left her house without being fed." Soon after, Simon de Montfort surprised a camp of Count Raymond.

<sup>n</sup> "Les envoyant ainsi brûler d'un feu éternel."—*Gestes Glorieuses in GuiZot, Coll. des Mémoires.*

<sup>o</sup> "Jamais (says the poet) dans la Chrétiente si haut baron ne fut je

crois pendu, avec tant d'autres chevaliers à ses côtés."—p. 113.

<sup>p</sup> "De fratre et filio se concepisse dixit."—*Chron. Turon. apud Faurel, p. 113.*

The Bishops preached in vain to five hundred heretics, but converted not one; sixty, however, they burned with great joy.<sup>a</sup> From Lavaur De Montfort advanced to the siege of Toulouse. The Bishop was in his camp. At the Bishop's command, all the clergy, barefooted, and bearing the host, marched out of the city; they were followed by five hundred of the White Brethren. But want of supplies, and the bold sallies of the garrison, forced him to break up the siege; he revenged himself by wasting the gardens, vineyards, and meadows. At the end of the year, when the Crusaders returned home, De Montfort himself was besieged in Castel Naudary: he revenged himself by a terrible defeat of the Count de Foix.

During the close of the year and the following one, the war raged, still to the advantage of De Montfort. The Archbishops of Rheims, Rouen, the Bishops of Paris, Laon, Toul were with him. At one time even Innocent, moved perhaps by the murmurs of Philip Augustus who began to be jealous of the growing power of De Montfort, seemed to waver into justice.<sup>b</sup> He commanded the restitution of the lands of the Counts of Foix and Comminges, and of Gaston de Bearn. He suspended his indulgences to the Crusaders. But he soon revoked again his own concessions, returned to his haughty and hostile tone, ordered the whole people to be raised by the offer of indulgences against the men of Toulouse and their allies. At a great parliament at Pamiers, De Montfort appeared as a Sovereign Prince; already the estates of the

<sup>a</sup> The Toulousans did not wage the war with less ferocity: at the taking of Pajols, sixty knights were slain o:

<sup>b</sup> Petr. V. C. 70. The Pope was “nimis credulus falsis suggestionibus dicti regis” (of France); afterwards he acted, “re melius cognitā.”

Nov. 1211.  
De Montfort  
Sovereign  
Prince.

Languedocian nobles were awarded to the northern conquerors. It was enacted that noble women, heiresses of free fiefs, should only marry the nobles of France, those who spoke the Langue d'Oil. To win popularity against the nobles, the peasants and serfs were declared exempt from arbitrary payments. The churchmen must not be without their share of the spoil. The Legate Arnold obtained the Archbishopric of Narbonne. The successor of Stephen Harding and St. Bernard was not content with the metropolitan dignity; he assumed the proud feudal title, involving great secular rights, of Duke of Narbonne. The Abbot of Vaux Cernay had the Bishopric of Carcassonne; other Cistercian monks received wealthy benefices. The Archbishop of Auch, the Bishop of Beziers were deposed;<sup>s</sup> the engineer, the Archdeacon of Paris, declined the Bishopric of Beziers.

Count Raymond, before the close of the year, had lost all but Toulouse and Montauban; he fled to the King of Arragon; the gallant Spaniard declared that he would support his cause (he was connected by a double tie) against the wicked race who would despoil him of his heritage.<sup>t</sup> The Consuls of Toulouse addressed a supplication likewise to the King against their Bishop and against the Legate. They declared that they always gave proofs of their orthodoxy against convicted heretics; they had burned many, were ready to burn more.<sup>u</sup> They accused the Legate and the Bishop of excommu-

<sup>s</sup> The Archbishop of Auch, Bernard de la Barthe (a Troubadour poet), resisted his degradation till 1214; he still boldly adhered to the side of Raymond.

<sup>t</sup> "Il est mon beau frère, dit-il, il a épousé une de mes sœurs, et l'autre je l'ai donnée pour femme à son frère."

J'irai donc les secourir contre cette méchante race, qui veut leur enlever leur héritage."—Fauriel, p. 199.

<sup>u</sup> "Unde multos combussimus, et adhuc cum invenimus, idem facere non cessamus."—See the petition in Bouquet, p. 206.

nicating them, because they employed routiers (the soldiers of fortune) whom themselves did not scruple to buy off by higher pay, though guilty of the worst and most sacrilegious crimes. The very soldiers who had murdered certain priests (on this the monk of Vaux Cernay dwells, as the great crime of the Toulousans) had been enlisted among his own troops by the Legate.

The King of Arragon, before he engaged in the war, made an appeal to the Pope. Innocent was again shaken, and began to have some mis-<sup>King of Arragon.</sup> trust in the representations of his Legates. He had set in motion a terrible engine, he could not arrest or regulate its movements. The Pope wrote to the Archbishop of Narbonne (the Abbot Arnold) and to Simon de Montfort, recounting the charges made against them. "They had not only invaded lands infected with heresy, but stretched out their rapacious hands to seize those of Catholics;" while the King of Arragon was engaged against the Saracens, they had infringed on his rights, waged war on his vassals, and occupied his territories. Count Raymond had offered to surrender all his dominions to his son, against whom was no charge or suspicion of heresy. Raymond should be admitted (the Pope now urged, or had before urged) to compurgation." Simon de Montfort was accused of wantonly shedding Catholic blood, under the pretence of extirpating heresy; "he was commanded to restore the

▼ "Ad illas nihilominus terras, quæ super hæresi nullâ notabantur infamia manus avidas extendistis."—Epist. xv. 212.

▼ "Quod tu convertens in Catholicos manus tuas, quibus suffecisse debuerat in homines hæreticæ pravitatis extendi per crucisignatorum exercitum

ad effusionem justi sanguinis et innocentium injuriam provocasti."—Epist. xv. 213. Simon is impaled on the horns of a pontifical dilemma. Either the inhabitants were Catholics or heretics: if Catholics, he had no right to invade their lands; if heretics, he ought not to let them live peaceably under his dominion.

territories which he had unjustly usurped, to the King of Arragon. But even the all-powerful Innocent was powerless in the cause of justice and humanity : his compunctionous visitings of mercy found no hearing even among the churchmen of the Crusade. The Council of Lavaur, attended by two archbishops as Legates, and by a great number of prelates, with one voice, determined to come to no terms with the “tyrant and heretic of Toulouse.” If his dominions were restored to him heresy must triumph. All the representations of the King of Arragon in favour of the Counts of Toulouse, of Foix, and Comminges, and of Gaston de Bearn, were contemptuously rejected. Their letters were absolutely furious—“Arm yourself, my Lord Pope, with the zeal of Phineas ; annihilate Toulouse, that Sodom, that Gomorrah, with all the wretches it contains ; let not the tyrant, the heretic Raymond, nor even his young son, lift up his head ; already more than half crushed, crush them to the very utmost.” Innocent was once more on their side ; he threatened the King of Arragon with a new Crusade.<sup>z</sup>

The great victory of Muret, in which Simon de Montfort with very inferior forces (he had at most about 1000 men-at-arms, about 400 squires) totally defeated,

<sup>z</sup> Epist. xvi. 28, 40. Hurter, with whom all Innocent's acts must be saintly, is obliged to take refuge in the imperfect information of the Pope, and the abuse of his confidence by his agents : an excuse for a weak pontiff, but not for one whose sagacity and penetration are so highly coloured by Hurter himself. “Wenn während dieses Krieges manches sich ereignete was mit Betrübniss erfüllen muss,

oder wenn derselbe in Raum und Zeit weiter sich erforderte, als die Erreichung des Zwecks, wozu er unternommen worden, so fällt hiervon keine Schuld auf Innocenz, der nicht überall sehen, in vielem auf Berichte von Männern sich verlassen musste, die seinen Vertrauen zu ihnen nicht immer mehr soehrten, wie es dem Besten der Kirche wünschbar war.” Vorrede—p. vi. Gestes Glorieuses.

with the loss of one knight and a few common soldiers, the combined forces of the King of Arragon and the Count of Toulouse, seemed to decide for ever the fate of the devoted land.<sup>7</sup> Pedro of Arragon, the victor of Naves de Tolosa, was slain ; his infant son, afterwards James I., fell into the hands of the conqueror at Carcassonne. The Counts of Toulouse, the father and son, fled.

The Pope, on the occasion of his sending a new Legate, the Cardinal Deacon, Peter of Benevento, Cardinal of St. Mary in Aquiro, in strange apocalyptic language celebrates this triumph, “The Red Horse (the Count of Toulouse) and his soldiers, conjoined with the Black Horse of heresy, had been discomfited. The sign which Innocent had raised on the dark mountain had gathered the valiant and the holy of the Lord to his aid. They had trampled down the pride of the Chaldeans.” The new Legate received the submission of the conquered princes, the Counts of Foix and Comminges and Rousillon, and the Viscount of Narbonne. They were sworn to renounce all heresy, all protection, all connivance with heretics ; to surrender, if required, all their principal fortresses to the Church of Rome and her Legate, to give no succour to the city of Toulouse. If they fulfilled not these conditions, their castles escheated to the Pope ; they were excommunicate, declared enemies and traitors to the Roman See. Even the Count of Toulouse was permitted to make his submission, but under harder conditions. Our compassion for the fate of Count Raymond

<sup>7</sup> Guizot, xv. 343. While the battle was going on, the whole clergy, bishops, abbots, continued chanting, so that they seemed “plut3t hurler que prier.” They chose the day of battle, that of the elevation of the cross.—Puy Laurent.

\* Epist. xvi. 167, dated Jan. 17, 1214.

is mitigated by the horror of his last act; he surprised his brother Baldwin, who had fallen off to De Montfort, and hung him on a walnut tree.\* Raymond now surrendered all his dominions, which he had before made over to his son, without reservation, to the See of Rome. He placed his person at his enemies' disposal, and offered to retire to England, if they should so decree, till he could make his peace. He promised to procure the submission of his son to the mercy of the Pope. Yet, if we are to believe the monk of Vaux Cernay, even mercy on these terms was but a fraud practised on the nobles, to give De Montfort time to subdue the still refractory cities, Agen, Cahors, Toulouse; a pious fraud suggested by God's Holy Spirit!<sup>b</sup>

Simon de Montfort had strengthened himself by the marriage of his son with Beatrice, heiress of Dauphiny. At a council at Montpellier, held Jan. 8, 1215, the Legate demanded the advice of five archbishops, twenty-eight bishops, many abbots and dignitaries, as to the course to be pursued with regard to the conquered territory. With one assent they chose Simon de Montfort Prince and Sovereign of the whole land. Thus all the native and hereditary princes were deposed; the old ancestral house of Toulouse, erewhile the greatest territorial princedom in France without excepting even the King, connected by blood or marriage with all the Sovereigns of Europe,

\* It is even said, but by the Monk, that the Count of Foix and his son tied the rope.

<sup>b</sup> "Egit ergo misericorditer divina dispositio, ut dum Legatus hostes fidei qui Narbonae erant congregati, aliceret et compesceret fraude sua, Comes Mon-

tisfortis et peregrini, qui venerunt a Francia, possent transire ad partes caturcenses et aginenses, et suos, immo Christi impugnare inimicos. O Legati fraus pia! O pietas fraudulenta!"—Petr. V. C. c. 78.

was despoiled of all : the whole of Languedoc, Catholic, as well as heretical inhabitants, were transferred to a new master.<sup>c</sup>

Toulouse submitted ; Prince Louis, son of Philip Augustus, who had now joined the Crusade, the Cardinal, the Bishop Fulk, and Simon de Montfort, held secret councils, whether to pillage or burn the city ; but De Montfort did not wish to ruin himself by destroying his own splendid and hard-won capital.<sup>d</sup> The Legate took possession of the strong castle, the Narbonnaise. The young Count withdrew to England, followed, after some time, by his father. The Crusade of Prince Louis, of France was a triumphant procession—he met no resistance. The walls of Toulouse and Narbonne were thrown down. But if the pomp was with Prince Louis, the gain of the victory was with De Montfort. Philip Augustus had never approved of his son's Crusade ; he beheld this new realm of De Montfort with no favourable eyes. When Louis appeared before him, on his return from the South, and described the wealth and power of Simon, the King gave no answer.<sup>e</sup>

<sup>c</sup> " C'est ainsi que Raymond VI., Comte de Toulouse, fut dépouillé de tous ses états, et que ce Prince, le plus grand terrier qui fut alors dans le royaume, sans en excepter le roi même, se vit enfin réduit à ne posséder plus une pouce de terre, sans que les liens de sang qui l'attachaient à presque tous les souverains de l'Europe fussent capables de le mettre à l'abri des entreprises de ceux qui en voulaient plus à ses dominions qu'à sa croyance." —Vaissette, p. 285.

<sup>d</sup> " Cependant le fils du Roi de France, qui consent à tout, Don Simon,

le Cardinal, et Folquet tous ensemble proposent en secret de saccager (d'abord) toute la ville ; puis d'y mettre le feu ardent (pour la brûler). Mais Don Simon réfléchit, que s'il détruit la ville, ce sera à son dommage." —Fauriel, 223. The advice of the Bishop in the Historian is even more atrocious.

<sup>e</sup> " Rex vero Francie audiens quod filius suus crucesignatus esset multum doluit, sed causam doloris ejus non est nostrum exponere." The monk's silence is significant.—Petr. V. G. c. 68.

The fourth Lateran Council,<sup>f</sup> one of the most numerous ever held in Christendom,<sup>g</sup> was called upon to decide the course to be taken against heretics, and especially the fate of Languedoc. It assumed the full power of deposing a Sovereign Prince, and awarding his dominions to a stranger. Count Raymond of Toulouse was for ever excluded from the sovereignty of the land, condemned to pass the rest of his life in exile, in some place appointed for him to do fit penance. A pension of 400 marks was reserved out of his revenues, which he would forfeit by any act of disobedience to the Church. To his wife, the sister of the King of Arragon, her dowry was secured on account of her virtue and piety. Provence and some other cantons, yet unconquered by the Crusaders, were to be reserved under the custody of trustworthy persons, as an inheritance for the young Count of Toulouse, if, when of age, he should have been obedient to the Church. As to the Counts of Foix and Comminges, nothing was enacted, but they were allowed some hopes of pardon.

Such were the acts of the Lateran Council. But the Troubadour<sup>h</sup> and the Historian describe the debates,

<sup>f</sup> The Council of Lateran declared the unity of God who created of nothing both souls and bodies (the Aristotelian doctrines of the eternity of matter had begun to prevail) the unity of the Church, out of which none can be saved: it first authoritatively proclaimed Transubstantiation.

<sup>g</sup> So great was the concourse of people that the good bishop of Amalfi was suffocated in the throng.—Chron. Amalf. apud Murat. A. T. i. p. 246. There were the Patriarchs of Constan-

tinople and Jerusalem, of Antioch and Alexandria (by deputy), 71 archbishops, 412 bishops, 860 abbots or priors.

<sup>h</sup> It is a curious question, whether the history is a prose version of the poem: if so, it is a free one, as it differs in many particulars. If the poem is the original, how far is it poetical? how far has the poet, who is usually unpoetically historical, here indulged invention? Poetically it is the best, the only part of the poem which is alive.

which led at length to these imperious decrees. Passages in other writers leave no doubt that the decision was resisted by many of the most powerful and generous prelates;<sup>i</sup> and confirmed with reluctance by the Pope himself. The Lateran Council, according to this account, was a long conflict between the temporal princes who demanded the restoration of their estates, and were supported by some of the <sup>Secret History.</sup> most distinguished churchmen, and the ecclesiastics of Languedoc; Arnold the Archbishop of Narbonne (though even he, from a personal quarrel about the rights of the Church of Narbonne, was somewhat moderated in his admiration of Simon de Montfort), and Fulk, the Bishop of Toulouse, the implacable enemy of Raymond. Innocent, the haughty Innocent, appears in the midst; mild, but wavering; seeing clearly that which was just, humane, merciful, and disposed to the better course; but overborne by the violence of the adverse party, and weakly yielding to that of which his mind and heart equally disapproved.<sup>k</sup> The whole scene is so characteristic as well as dramatic, that the chief points may be accepted (certainly they formed part of the popular belief) as to the proceedings of that great Council.

Raymond and his son, accompanied by the Counts of Foix and Comminges, and many other nobles of Languedoc, were admitted to the presence of the Pope, seated in full consistory among his cardinals and other

<sup>i</sup> "Verum quidem est quod fuerint aliqui, etiam quod est gravius, de Prælatis, qui nostræ fidei adversi, pro restitutione dictorum Comitum laborabant; sed non prævaluit consilium Ahitophel, frustratum et desiderium malignorum."—Petr. V. C. c. 83.

<sup>k</sup> Hurter, solicitous to catch any gleams of equity and gentleness, which may soften the sterner characters of his hero and saint, follows without hesitation the history, not perceiving the humiliation of Innocent, thus reduced to be the tame instrument of the bigotry of others.

prelates : they knelt before him ; the young Raymond presented letters from the King of England (who had received hospitably and made splendid presents to his nephew). The King of England expressed his indignation at the usurpation of the inheritance of Raymond by Simon de Montfort. The Pope was moved by the beauty and graceful bearing of the young Prince, thought of his wrongs, and wept.<sup>m</sup>

Count Raymond began at length to represent the aggressions and injustice of the Legate and of De Montfort, who, notwithstanding all his submission to the Pope, and all the treaties, had despoiled him of his territories. He was followed by the Counts of Foix and Comminges complaining of the pillage of their lands, and the lawless massacre of their subjects. "The Church not only should not sanction, it should prohibit such cruelties in a land which was absolutely free from all taint of heresy, and in every respect submissive to the Church."<sup>n</sup> The Pope having heard the depositions, and read the letters of the King of England, was in great wrath with the Legate and with De Montfort. First one of the Cardinals, then Berengar, Abbot of St. Tiberi, rose and supported the complaints of the appellants. Fulk, the Bishop of Toulouse, sternly denied all these asseverations. He defied the Count de Foix to deny that his dominions swarmed with heretics ; in proof of this, the castle of Monsegur had been surprised,

<sup>m</sup> "Le Pape considère l'enfant et son air, il connaît sa noble race, il sait les torts . . . de l'Eglise et du clergé, eunemis (du Comte), et il a le cœur si trouble de pieté et d' : souci

. . . qu'il en soupire, et en pleure de ses deux yeux." — Fauriel, p. 127. The Pope, says the poet, declared that

Count Raymond was not mécréant, but catholique de fait et de propos.

<sup>n</sup> The speech of the Count de Foix in the poem is striking.—pp. 249-251. We hear nothing of the enormities charged against De Foix by the monk of Vaux Cernay. But did the Count renounce all heresy ?

and all the inhabitants burned; “the sister of the Count de Foix had brought her husband to an evil end on account of these heretics; she had lived in Pamiers without daring to leave the city; the heretics had greatly increased through her influence. Count Raymond and the Count de Foix could not deny that they had surprised and put to the sword six thousand German Crusaders, on their way to join the army of the Legate.” The Count de Foix fearlessly replied, that he was not responsible for the acts of his sister; the castle of Monsegur was hers, left to her by her father; she was its lawful Sovereign. The Germans were robbers, who were ravaging the country. “For the Bishop of Toulouse, your Holiness is greatly deceived in him; under the show of good faith and amity he is always concerting treachery: his actions are devilish: it is entirely through his malignity that the city of Toulouse has suffered ruin, waste, robbery: more than ten thousand men have perished through him. Thus the Legate and the Count de Montfort make common cause in their iniquity.” The Baron of Vilamour deposed with great gravity<sup>o</sup> to the atrocities perpetrated by De Montfort; Raymond de Roquetaillade to the treachery by which the Viscount de Beziers, no heretic, had been betrayed into their power, and the manner of his death. The Pope listened in silence to these solemn charges; at their close he was heard to sigh deeply.

No sooner had the Pope withdrawn,<sup>p</sup> than he was beset by the prelates and cardinals in the party of the Legate and of De Montfort. They urged, that if they

<sup>n</sup> “Il ne s’effraye point, et parle  
fidèlement, regardé, entendu, écouté de

<sup>p</sup> Into a garden, says the poet, to  
dissipate his chagrin and divert his  
thoughts.

were compelled to surrender the territories and lordships which they had won, no one would embark in the cause of the Church, or run any hazard in her defence. The Pope took down a book (was it the Bible ?), and showed them that if they did not make restitution of all the lands they had usurped, they would be guilty of great sin.<sup>a</sup> “Wherefore, I give leave to Raymond of Toulouse and his heirs to recover their lands and lordships from all who hold them unjustly.” Then might be seen those prelates murmuring against the Pope like men in desperation.<sup>r</sup> The Pope stood aghast at their violence. The Precentor of Lyons, one of the most learned clerks in the world, rose, with great dignity, and rebuked the insolence and contumacy of the prelates. “ You know well, my Lords, the submission of Count Raymond, and the surrender of his castles. If you do not restore, and compel to be restored to him his lands, you will be justly reproached by God and man. Henceforth no one will have any reliance on you or your decrees ; and that will be great disgrace and dishonour to the whole Church militant. And I say to you, Bishop of Toulouse, that you are greatly in fault ; that you betray your want of charity to Count Raymond, and to the people of which you are the pastor ; you have kindled a fire in Toulouse which will never be extinguished ; you have caused the death of ten thousand men, and will of many more, if by your false representations you persist in your wrongful course. Through you the Court of Rome is defamed throughout the world ; so many men should not be despoiled and destroyed to gratify the pride and violence of one.”

<sup>a</sup> “Et y trouve un sort,” says the poet. Sortes Biblicæ were not uncommon.

<sup>r</sup> The poet says, “Folquet notre Evêque . . . parle au Pape, ausſi doucement qu'il peut.”—p. 243.

The Pope seems to have been appalled; he gently exculpated himself, as innocent of these iniquities, into which he had been betrayed by ignorance of the real facts. Even the Archbishop of Narbonne, the Legate Arnold, alienated from De Montfort, supported the Precentor of Lyons. But the wily Genoese, Theodisc, who had been so much in the confidence of Innocent, adhered to De Montfort. He urged his valuable services, that he had swept the land of heretics, that he had been the champion of the Church and her rights. Innocent, having heard both parties, declared to Theodisc, that the contrary of his statements was true. "The Legate had oppressed the good and just, and left the wicked without punishment: complaints had reached him from all quarters, against the Legate and De Montfort."

The prelates demanded that at least the territories of Bigorre, Carcassonne, Toulouse, Agen, Quercy, the Albigeois, Foix and Comminges (the whole conquests of the Crusaders), should be left to De Montfort. "If he be deprived of these lands," they boldly declared, "we swear that we will aid him in their maintenance against all and in defiance of all."<sup>159</sup> The Pope calmly answered that nothing should tempt him to injustice; "even if Raymond were guilty, his son was blameless; and the son was not to bear the iniquity of the father."

It is difficult to imagine Innocent III. thus confronted, compelled into injustice, by men who boasted themselves to be better churchmen than the Pope. But the decree of the Lateran Council, despoiling Raymond of Toulouse of all his lands and awarding them to De

---

■ "Et si cas es, que tu, senhor, ly tots nos ly ayudaran et secouren."—  
vellas ostar le dit pays, et terre, nos te Guerre des Albigeois, Bonquet, p.  
promenten et juran, que tots envers 159.

Montfort, is an undeniable historic fact, rests on a decree of Innocent himself, addressed to all Christendom, and confirmed by his successor Honorius III.<sup>t</sup>

Yet, according to the historian, Innocent attempted a compromise. He offered the territory of the Venaisin to the younger Raymond, in compensation for the land of Toulouse, which could not be wrested from the strong hand of De Montfort.<sup>u</sup> “If he has courage,” the poet makes the Pope say, “the youth will recover his land;” and he then makes a prophet of the Pope, “The stone will at length be hurled, and all the world will say that it has fallen on the head of the sinner.” Count Raymond retired to Viterbo, leaving his son under the protection of the Pope. Young Raymond at length departed with the benediction of the Pope.<sup>x</sup>

There is war again in Languedoc, but no longer a Crusade for the extirpation of heresy, it is the iron hand of an usurping conqueror, determined to maintain his conquests; on the other side, no partial, but a general insurrection of the whole people in favour of their hereditary princes against a foreign invader, a gallant attempt again and for ever to break the yoke of a tyrant, to return to the milder rule of their ancient sovereigns. No sooner had the two Counts landed at Marseilles, than they were greeted by a burst of enthusiasm. Avignon, Tarascon, and other cities

<sup>t</sup> Bouquet, pp. 598, 599; p. 722.

<sup>u</sup> “Barons, reprend le Pape, puisque *je ne puis la lui ôter, qu'il la garde bien s'il peut : et qu'il ne s'en laisse pas chasser, car jamais de mon vouloir il ne sera prêché pour lui.*”—Fauriel, p. 255.

<sup>x</sup> The parting between the Pope and young Raymond is touchingly told by

the Troubadour. The Pope gives him good advice, and recommends him to wait for better times. “It is hard,” says the youth, “that a man of Winchester is to share my land with me! All I ask is that I may be permitted to reconquer my dominions if I can.” “God grant you,” said the Pope, “a good beginning and a good ending.”

opened their gates. Young Raymond is soon at the head of a force which enables him to declare war against De Montfort, and to form the siege of Beaucaire. Now became more manifest every day the decline in the power of the clergy;<sup>y</sup> the Crusaders themselves have misgivings as to the holiness of their cause. De Montfort's most ardent admirers begin to discern the darker parts of his character, his inordinate ambition, his insatiable rapacity. Simon de Montfort is himself astonished that God should cease to confine exclusive favour to himself, and should seem disposed to the sinful youth.<sup>z</sup>

Toulouse was eager to receive the heir of her ancient house. De Montfort was obliged to hasten to secure its wavering fidelity by the sternest measures. He treated it like a conquered city, exacted enormous sums. The Bishop had exhorted the noblest inhabitants <sup>Risings in Toulouse.</sup> to go out in procession to welcome the Count. But the plunder of the city by the Bishop and the Count were so shameless, that in a general rising, Guy de Montfort and the Bishop were driven out. De Montfort again forced his way within the walls, was again

<sup>y</sup> See the speech of Bertrand of Avignon in the poem. "Car nous avons éprouvé et senti avec douleur, que les clercs on menti quand ils nous disaient, qu'en répandant le feu, qu'en frappant de glaive, qu'en forçant notre vrai seigneur à s'en aller faidit . . . nous obéirons tout bonnement à Jesus Christ."—p. 299.

<sup>z</sup> "Beau père," says Guy de Montfort, in the poem, "il (Dieu) a vu et jugé votre conduite, pourvu que tout le bien et tout l'argent (du pays) soient à vous, vous prenez peu de soucie de la mort des hommes."—p. 345. Com-

pare 445, Gul. de Pod. Laurent. c. xxvii. It is difficult to mark the precise turning point of the Troubadour into a flaming patriot. The restoration of "parage," chivalry, and courtesy is his delight. Yet Simon, in his own esteem, is still the champion of the Church. "Puisque l'Eglise m'a octroyée le pays; puisque je suis de l'Eglise les œuvres, les ordres et les discours: puisque je suis bien méritant et mon adversaire pêcheur, c'est pour moi, dis-je, grande merveille que Dieu favorise (cet enfant)." . . .

repelled, having set the city on fire in many places. But the citizens unwisely accepted the treacherous mediation of the Prelate. "I swear by God and the holy Virgin, and the body of the Redeemer, by my whole order, the Abbot and other dignitaries, that I give you good counsel, better have I never given. If the Count inflict on you the least wrong, bring your complaints before me, and God and I will see you righted." The citizens, on the persuasion of the Bishop, gave the hostages demanded (the citadel, the Narbonnaise, still in the power of De Montfort, was crowded with them), they restored the prisoners which they had taken, and, more strangely still, surrendered their arms.\* The first act of De Montfort, who was hardly dissuaded by better counsel from totally destroying the city, was the demand of 30,000 marks of silver, the demolition of the walls and every stronghold in the city, and the plunder of the inhabitants to the very last piece of cloth or measure of meal. "O noble city of Toulouse!" exclaims the poet, "thy very bones are broken!"

So closed the year 1216, during which Pope Innocent III. had died, and had been succeeded by Honorius III.

During the ensuing year the war with the young Count Raymond continued to the advantage July 16, A.D. 1217. of De Montfort. On a sudden the old Count,<sup>b</sup> with a body of Spanish soldiers, appeared before Toulouse. The city received him with the utmost joy; new walls were hastily raised, new trenches dug. Many of the nobles levied troops and threw themselves into

\* Gul. de Pod. Laurent. gives a different view of this affair.—c. xxxix.

<sup>b</sup> The suddenness of the appearance of Count Raymond is indicated by a fine touch in the poem. The Countess de Montfort is told that she must fly at once. "La Comtesse, quand elle l'entend, bat ses deux mains l'une contre l'autre. Quoi, dit-elle, et j'étais si heureuse hier."

the city. First Guy de Montfort,<sup>c</sup> then Simon himself, who hurried to the spot, were ignominiously repulsed. The Bishop of Toulouse and the wife of Montfort sought aid in France. A new Crusade was preached. Pope Honorius entered with ardour into the cause of De Montfort. It was again that of the whole clergy. Once more excommunications were menaced in some cases, uttered in others. The new King of Arragon was threatened with interdict; the consuls of Toulouse, Avignon, Marseilles, Tarascon, and other cities, the young Count Raymond, the Count de Foix were summoned under this penalty to renounce their alliance with rebellious Toulouse. For nine months the siege continued. If the sentiments attributed by the Troubadour to the Legate were either true, or supposed to be true by the inhabitants of Toulouse, it may account for the obstinacy of their defence. “The fire of hell has again kindled in this city, which is full of sin and crime. The old Lord is again within its walls, against whom whosoever will wage war will be saved before God. You are about to reconquer the city, to break into the houses, out of which no single soul, neither man nor woman, shall escape alive! not one shall be spared in church, in sanctuary, in hospital! It is decided in the secret counsels of Rome, that the deadly and consuming fire shall pass over them.”<sup>d</sup> But the counsels of Rome were not those of Divine Providence. At the close of the nine months Simon headed an attack; a stone from

<sup>c</sup> In the poem Guy de Montfort is contrasted with Simon de Montfort, whom he calls “dur et tyran,” and declares that God will punish his *“eacheries.”*

<sup>d</sup> Fauriel, 433. See before this

the dialogue of the Cardinal and the Bishop, 429; and after, 455. “Et si quelques uns des vôtres y meurent en combattant, le Saint Pape et leurs sommes garants, qu’ils porteront (au ciel) la couronne des innocents.”

an engine struck the champion of Jesus Christ (as he was called by his admirers) on the head : he had just time to commend himself to the mercy of God and of the holy Virgin. God was reproached with his death, the divine justice was arraigned. It is added by the monkish historian, still faithful to his fortunes, that he received likewise five wounds with arrows ; and in this respect he is likened to the Redeemer in whose cause he died, and with whom “we trust he is in bliss and glory.”\*

The war did not end with the death of Simon de Montfort ; but the religious character, which it had once more assumed, again died away.

A Crusade was headed by Louis of France ; but that was only a bold and premature attempt of the sovereign Crusade of Prince Louis. to unite the great domain of Southern France Aug. 1, 1219. to the crown. After the capture and atrocious massacre of Marmande, and a short and unsuccessful siege of Toulouse, Louis returned inglorious to his father's dominions. A truce was made between the young Count Raymond, and Amaury de Montfort.<sup>A.D. 1224.</sup> It was said that Raymond proposed to marry the daughter of his rival. Two years after

\* “Vous entendez crier hautement —O Dieu, tu n'es pas juste—puisque tu as voulu la mort du comte et que tu as souffert (un tel) dommage. Bien fol est qui te defend, et se fait ton serviteur.”—Fauriel, 573. In Toulouse the triumphant cry was that he died without confession. The Bishop's eulogy was this : “ Jamais en ce monde ne faillit moins que lui ; et depuis que Dieu endura le martyr et fut mis en croix, il ne voulut et ne souffrit jamais une aussi grande mort que celui du

Comte.” The Count of Soissons replied : “ Je vous reprend à bon droit, pour que Sainte Eglise n'ait pas (de votre dire) mauvais renom ; ne le nommez pas sanctissime, car nul ne meritit si fort que celui qui l'appelle saint, lui qui est mort sans confession.”—p. 577. Compare the Poet's language, p. 587.

<sup>f</sup> It is a curious illustration of the manners. “Sub treugae securitate comes Tolosanus entravit Carcassonam, et ibi cum comite Amalrico pacuit usq[ue] nocte.”

Amaury made over his dominions to Louis VIII., King of France.

The vengeance of the Church followed the older Raymond even after death. Dying excommunicate he could not be buried in holy ground. In vain his son adduced proofs that he had given manifest signs of penitence on his deathbed: notwithstanding a solemn inquest held by commissioners appointed by the Pope, and the examination of above one hundred witnesses, <sup>Aug. 1, 1222</sup> the inexorable sentence was still unrepealed; <sup>e</sup> the infected body was still unburied; it remained for three hundred years in the sacristy of the Knights Templars. To posterity the great crime of Raymond is the barbarous execution of his brother Baldwin. Baldwin, indeed, had deserted, betrayed, taken up arms against him; but there had never been fraternal love between them. Raymond, it was said, had withheld part of his brother's inheritance. And mercy, though it ought to be the virtue of the persecuted, rarely is so.

The vast army which descended on Languedoc under Louis, now King of France, was that of conquest rather than a Crusade. The cities were appalled, they opened their gates; Avignon alone made a noble resistance. Count Raymond bowed before the storm. On <sup>Nov. 8,</sup> <sup>1226.</sup> his return, after the seeming submission of almost the whole land, Louis died of exhaustion and fatigue at Montpensier in Auvergne.

The treaty of Paris, after the accession of St. Louis, restored peace, for a time at least, to the <sup>Apr. 12, 1229.</sup> <sup>Treaty of</sup> afflicted land. The terms were dictated by the Papal Legate, approved by the King of France

Count Raymond VII. swore:—I. Fealty to his liege lord the King of France and to the Church. II. He swore to do immediate justice on all heretics, their abettors and partisans, even though his vassals, kindred or friends. III. To detect, in order to their punishment, all such heretics, according to the rules laid down by the Legate, and to pay for two years two marks, afterwards one mark, on the conviction of each heretic. IV. To maintain peace in his realm. Besides to maintain the rights of the Church; to respect, and cause to be respected, all sentences of excommunication, and to compel all persons excommunicate to reconcile themselves within a year to the Church, under pain of confiscation of their property. To restore all estates and immunities to the Church; to pay, and enforce the due payment of tithes; to pay to certain Cistercian abbeys, Clairvaux, and others, 10,000 marks of silver; to pay 5000 marks for the fortification of the citadel, the Narbonnaise, and those in other cities, to be held as securities by the King of France; to maintain certain professors of theology; to take the cross for five years in some Mohammedan country. On these, and other conditions relating to the boundaries of his dominions, of which he was obliged to abandon large portions (his daughter was to be married to the son of the French King), Raymond VII., never accused of heresy, received absolution. The same scene took place as with his father. With naked shoulders, bare feet, the son of Raymond of Toulouse was led up the church of Notre Dame, scourged as he went by the Legate. “Count of Narbonne, by virtue of the powers entrusted to me by the Pope, I absolve thee from my excommunication.” “Amen,” answered the Count. He rose from his knees, no longer sovereign of the South of France, but a vassal

of limited dominions.<sup>h</sup> His father on his penance renounced seven castles, the son seven provinces.<sup>i</sup>

But though the open war was at an end, the Church still pursued her exterminating warfare against her still rebellious subjects. The death of Simon de Montfort had given courage to the Albigensians. Bartholomew of Carcassonne, who had fled, it was said, to that land (the Bulgarian) where dwelt the Pope of the Manicheans, re-appeared; he called himself the vicar of that mysterious pontiff, he re-organised the churches. Another teacher, William of Castries, was ordained, it was said, Bishop of Rases. The Inquisition continued its silent, but not less inhuman, hardly less destructive crusade. That tribunal, with all its peculiar statutes, its jurisdiction, its tremendous agency, was founded during this period. It is difficult to fix its precise date; but it is coincident with the establishment of a special court, legatine or charged with those peculiar functions which superseded the ordinary episcopal jurisdiction, and appropriated to itself the cognisance, punishment, suppression of heresy.

The statutes of the Council of Toulouse, framed after the successful termination of the war, in order Council of  
Toulouse.  
A.D. 1229. to extirpate every lingering vestige of heresy, form the code of persecution, which not

<sup>h</sup> Barran et Darragan. It is to be regretted that this work has preferred to be an historical romance rather than a history. The authors have failed in both; it is neither Walter Scott nor Livy or Tacitus.

<sup>i</sup> See in Vaissette the territories ceded to the King of France. "On voit par ce traité, que les principaux instigateurs de la guerre contre Ray-

mond songeoint bien moins de sa catholicité, qu'à le déposséder de ses dominions et à s'enrichir de ses dépouilles. . . . Quant à sa propre personne il ne fut jamais suspect d'hérésie, et il ne fut excommunié que parceque il ne voulait pas renoncer ses justes prétensions sur la patrimonie de ses ancêtres."—Hist. de Languedoc, in. 374.

merely aimed at suppressing all public teaching, but the more secluded and secret freedom of thought. It was a system which penetrated into the most intimate sanctuary of domestic life; and made delation not merely a merit and a duty, but an obligation also, enforced by tremendous penalties.

The archbishops, bishops, and exempt abbots, were to appoint in every parish one priest, and three or more lay inquisitors, to search all houses and buildings in order to detect heretics, and to denounce them to the archbishop or bishop, the lord, or his bailiff, so as to ensure their apprehension. The lords were to make the same inquisition in every part of their estates. Whoever was convicted of harbouring a heretic forfeited the land to his lord, and was reduced to personal slavery. If he was guilty of such concealment from negligence, not from intention, he received proportionate punishment. Every house in which a heretic was found was to be razed to the ground, the farm confiscated. The bailiff who should not be active in detecting heretics was to lose his office, and be incapacitated from holding it in future. Heretics, however, were not to be judged but by the bishop or some ecclesiastical person. Any one might seize a heretic on the lands of another. Heretics who recanted were to be removed from their homes, and settled in Catholic cities; to wear two crosses of a different colour from their dress, one on the right side, one on the left. They were incapable of any public function unless reconciled by the Pope or by his Legate. Those who recanted from fear of death were to be immured for ever. All persons, males of the age of fourteen, females of twelve, were to take an oath of abjuration of heresy, and of their Catholic faith; if absent, and not appearing within fifteen days, they were

held suspected of heresy. All persons were to confess, and communicate three times a year, or were in like manner under suspicion of heresy. No layman was permitted to have any book of the Old or New Testament, especially in a translation, unless *perhaps* the Psalter, with a breviary, or the Hours of the Virgin. No one suspected of heresy could practise as a physician. Care was to be taken that no heretic had access to sick or dying persons. All wills were to be made in the presence of a priest. No office of trust was to be held by one in evil fame as a heretic. Those were in evil fame who were so by common report, or so declared by good and grave witnesses before the bishop.<sup>k</sup>

But statutes of persecution always require new statutes rising above each other in regular gradations of rigour and cruelty. The Legate found the canons of Toulouse to be eluded or inefficient. He summoned a council at Melun, attended by the Archbishop of Narbonne and other prelates. The unhappy Count of Toulouse was compelled to frame the edicts of this council into laws for his dominions.<sup>m</sup> The first provision showed that persecution had wrought despair. It was directed against those who had murdered, or should murder, or conceal the murderers of persecutors

<sup>k</sup> The statutes of Toulouse in Mansi, sub ann. Compare Limborth, Historia Inquisitionis. Among the other decrees of the Council was one which declared the absolute immunity of all clerks from taxation, unless they were merchants or married (*mercatores vel uxorati*). If one succeeded to the inheritance of a lay fief, he was answerable for its burthens. They were likewise free from tolls (*péages*). Every person was bound to attend church on

Sundays and holidays. The statutes against private wars were in a more Christian spirit, only beyond the age. Every male above 14 was sworn to keep the peace; and heavy penalties denounced against all who should violate it. This was perhaps a law of foreign conquerors in a subjugated land.

<sup>m</sup> Conventus Meldunensis. Statuta Raimondi, A.D. 1233. Labbe Concil. sub ann.

of heretics. A reward of one mark was set on the head of every heretic, to be paid by the town, or village, or district to the captor. It was evident that the heretics had now begun to seek concealment in cabins, in caves, and rocks, and forests; not merely was every house in which one should be seized to be razed to the ground, but all suspected caves or hiding places were to be blocked up; with a penalty of twenty-five livres of Toulouse to the lord on whose estate such houses or places of concealment of evil report should be found. Those who did not assist in the capture of heretics were liable to punishment. If any one was detected after death to have been a heretic his property was confiscated. Those who had made over their estates in trust, before they became heretics, nevertheless forfeited such estates. Those who attempted to elude the law by moving about under pretence of trade or pilgrimage, were ordered to render an account of their absence.

A.D. 1233. A council at Beziers enforced upon the clergy, under pain of suspension, or of deprivation, the denunciation of all who should not attend divine service in their churches on the appointed days, especially those suspected of heresy.

Yet heresy, even the Manichean heresy, was not yet extinguished. Many years, as will appear,<sup>n</sup> must intervene of the administration of the most atrocious code of procedure which has ever assumed the forms of justice; more than one formidable insurrection; the forcible expulsion of the terrible Inquisition; the assassination, the martyrdom as it was profanely called, of more than one inquisitor, before the South of France collapsed into final spiritual subjection.

---

<sup>n</sup> See on for the proceedings of the Inquisition.

Yet, Latin Christianity might boast at length to have crushed out the life, at least in outward appearance, of this insurrection within her own borders. No language of Latin descent was permanently to speak in its religious services to the people, to form a Christian literature of its own, to have full command of the Scriptures in its vernacular dialect. The Crusade revenged itself on the poetry of the Troubadour, once the bold assailant of the clergy, by compelling it, if not to total silence, to but a feeble and uncertain sound.

END OF VOL. V.